

E
441
Supp
RIGHT AND WRONG

AMONGST THE

ABOLITIONISTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY LETTER BY

HARRIET MARTINEAU,

AUTHOR OF "THE MARTYR AGE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;"

And an Appendix.

BY JOHN A. COLLINS,

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

"Let us meet
And question this most shameful piece of work,
To know it further. Fears and scruples shake us:
In the great hand of God I stand: and thence,
Against the undivulged pretence, I fight,
Of treasonous malice."

SHAKESPEARE.

 BOSTON PUBLIC LIB'Y

SECOND EDITION.

GLASGOW:

PUBLISHED BY GEO. GALLIE, 99, BUCHANAN STREET.

SOLD BY JOHN SYMINGTON & CO. J. M'LEOD, & D. ROBERTSON, BOOKSELLERS;
AND BY WILLIAM SMEAL;

DUBLIN, P. KENNEDY, OFFICE OF THE HIBERNIAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
28, ANGLESEA STREET.

M D C C C X L I.



INTRODUCTION.

THE following Letter, to one of the most devoted among the Abolitionists in Great Britain, from MISS MARTINEAU, the well-known and talented authoress of "*The Martyr Age of the United States of America*," contains sentiments so admirable, and gives such a clear exposition of the Causes of the Division among American Abolitionists, that it is inserted here, as an Introduction to this pamphlet :—

TYNEMOUTH, NORTHUMBERLAND, 27th Feb., 1841.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—I have read the Statements in "*Right and Wrong*" among the Abolitionists of the United States," with respect to the Differences between the two Anti-Slavery Societies in America, with a strong and painful interest. I wish I could adequately express my sense of the duty of every one interested in the cause of the Negro,—of Human Freedom at large,—to read and deeply meditate this piece of history. I am not more firmly persuaded of any thing, than that those who, on the present occasion, listen to one side only, or refuse to hear either, are doing the deepest injury in their power to the Anti-Slavery cause, and sowing the seeds of a bitter future repentance.

I am aware how distasteful are the details of a strife. I know but too well, from my own experience, how natural it is to turn away, with a faint and sickening heart, from the exposure of the enmities of those whose first friendship sprang up in the field of benevolent labours. I fully understand the feelings of offended delicacy which would close the ears and seal the lips of those who have been fellow-workers with both the parties now alienated. Among all these causes of recoil, I see how it is but too probable that the Anti-Slavery parties on the other side of the Atlantic may be left by many of their British brethren to "settle their own affairs," to "fight their own battles." But if I had a voice which would penetrate wherever I wished, I would ask in the depths of every heart that feels for the Slave whether it should be so ;—whether such indifference and recoil may not be as criminal in us as dissension in them ;—whether, in declining to do justice to the true friends of the Slave, (on whichever side they may appear to be) we may not be guilty of treachery as fatal as compromising with his enemies.

Those who devote themselves to the redemption of an oppressed class or race do, by their act of self-devotion, pledge themselves to the discharge of the lowest and most irksome offices of protection, as much as to that of the most cordial and animating. We are bound, not only to fight against foes whom we never saw, and upon whom our sympathies never rested ;—not only to work for millions of poor creatures, so grateful for our care, that they are ready to kiss the hem of our garments. This kind of

service, however lavish it may require us to be of our labour, our time, our money, is easy enough in comparison with one which is equally binding upon us. It is also our duty to withdraw our sympathy and countenance from our fellow-labourers, (however great their former merits and our love,) when they compromise the cause. It is our duty to expose their guilt when, by their act of compromise, they oppress and betray those brethren whose nobleness is a rebuke to themselves. This painful duty may every friend of the Negro in this country now find himself called upon to discharge, if he gives due attention to the state of Anti-Slavery affairs in America. If he does *not* give this attention, it would be better for him that he never named the Negro and his cause: for it is surely better to stand aloof from a philanthropic enterprise than to mix up injustice with it.

The first movers in the Anti-Slavery cause in America, those who have stood firm through the fierce persecutions of many years, who have maintained their broad platform of catholic principles, who have guarded their original Constitution from innovation and circumscription,—Garrison, and his corps of devout, devoted, and catholic fellow-labourers, with the Bible in their heart of hearts, and its spirit in all their ways, are now in a condition in which they need our support. They have been oppressed, betrayed, pillaged, and slandered. Not they, but their foes, are the innovators, the bigots, the unscrupulous proselyters, the preachers of a new doctrine, modified to propitiate the pro-Slavery spirit of the country in which they live. No one will call my words too strong, my accusations exaggerated, who will read the evidence relating to the transfer of the *Emancipator*, (for one instance) or, casting an eye upon the statement of accounts of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will perceive who voted into their own pockets the money by which the *Emancipator* might have been sustained, under whose commission the assailants of the Old Organization crossed the Atlantic, and at whose expense they travelled throughout our country, sowing calumnies against Garrison and his faithful companions through the length and breadth of our land. When the friends of the Slave here are told of treachery, pillage, and slander, will they hazard being a party to the guilt, for want of enquiry, even though the London Anti-Slavery Committee, and their organ, the *Reporter*, at present appear to stand in that predicament? If they would avoid such a liability, let them read and consider the Statement by which the case is placed fully before them.

No one is more ready than I to make allowance for lapse in the friends of the Negro in America. I have seen too much of the suffering (not conceivable here) consequent upon a profession of Anti-Slavery principles, to wonder that there are but few who can endure, from year to year, the infliction from without, the probing of the soul within, which visits the apostles of freedom in a land which maintains Slavery on its soil. From my heart I pity those who, having gone into the enterprise, find that they have not strength for it, and that they are drawn by their weakness into acts of injustice towards such as are stronger than themselves;—for those who are not with the thorough-going are necessarily against them. We must regard with even respectful compassion the first misgivings, before they have become lapse. But what then must we feel,—what ought we to do—for those who *have* strength,—for those who *can* suffer to the end,—for those who are, after the pelting of a ten years' pitiless storm, as firm, as resolved, as full of vital warmth as ever,—as prepared still to abide the tempest, till the deluge of universal conviction shall sweep away

the iniquity of Slavery from the earth? Shall we refuse to hear the tale of their injuries, of their justification, because others have refused, or because the story is painful? May we dare to call ourselves workers in the Anti-Slavery cause while thus deserting the chief of its apostles now living in the world?

All believe that the truth will finally prevail; and you and I, dear friend, have a firm faith that therefore the Old Organization, with Garrison at its head, will prevail, at length, over the base enmity of the seceders. But we ought not to be satisfied with their prevailing *at length*, till we see whether they cannot be enabled to stand their ground *now*. Not a moment is to be lost. Not for a moment should their noble hearts be left uncheered;—not for a moment should the Slave-holder be permitted to fan his embers of hope;—not for a moment should the American Slave be compelled to tremble at the adversity of his earliest and staunchest friends, if we can, by any effort, obtain a hearing for the cause. Let us urge and rouse all who are about us,—not to receive our mere assertions,—not to take our convictions upon trust,—but to read, search out, and weigh the evidence, and judge for themselves.

This is all that is needed; for I believe there is not a friend of the Slave, in any part of the world, who, knowing the facts, would not make haste to offer his right hand to Garrison and his company, and his voice and purse to their cause.

I am, yours very truly,

HARRIET MARTINEAU.

PREFACE.

IT is a fact which cannot be disguised, and which ought, *in its causes*, to be well understood, that there is an unhappy division among the Abolitionists in America—that they are divided into two parties, both professedly holding the same principles, and adopting the same measures, to procure the Immediate Abolition of Slavery; yet, strange to say, one party exercises the most bitter and unrelenting hostility against the other—*strange*, because it would seem natural to suppose, that if they were united on this subject, *in principle*, they would not be hostile to each other in action.

A minority has seceded from the Original American Anti-Slavery Society, and formed a rival Association, the object of which, interpreted by its official organ, agents, and auxiliaries, appears to be the entire annihilation of the Society from which it has seceded.

This opposition is based upon the alleged ground, that the American Anti-Slavery Society makes “Woman’s Rights,” “Non-Resistance,” and other extraneous questions, a necessary part of the Anti-Slavery principles:—that prominent and leading Abolitionists were constantly disturbing the harmony of the Anti-Slavery meetings, by forcing upon them their peculiar religious and political views; and that the objectors were compelled to secede, and form a new society, for the sake of peace and the interests of the Slave.

Such are the charges. To them all, the American Anti-Slavery Society pleads, NOT GUILTY. It denies (and its official proceedings will corroborate the truth of the denial,) ever having entertained, *as a Society*, any other views than that Slavery was a sin against God, and ought immediately to be abolished.—By its constitution, it can proscribe no person on account of his religion, country, sex, complexion, sect or caste, but is bound to welcome all as fellow-labourers, who will co-operate for Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation. It silences no person who feels moved to plead for all such as are under oppression. Its platform is on the most broad and catholic principles; and while it establishes no religious or political test of membership, but is common to all persons, it denies, at the same time, the right of any one, to make *his* peculiar religious or political opinions binding on his associates, as Abolitionists. Such is the reply of the American Anti-Slavery Society to the charges brought against it.

The design of the following pages is to prove, that the American Anti-Slavery Society has, from its origin to the present time, pursued one uniform and consistent course of action. That its principles and measures are the same now, as at its formation in 1833,—the same as at the time of the “American Union” in 1835, when a most artful attempt was

made by a body of clergymen, under the plea of love for the Slave, to propitiate the pro-Slavery spirit of the prejudiced multitude, by withdrawing from the enterprise the life-giving energy of its principles;—the same as at the time of the “Clerical Appeal” of 1837, when another subtle and crafty movement was made by some Anti-Slavery ministers, to deliver over the enterprise into the hands of the Clergy, by destroying the Anti-Slavery principle, through the destruction of its essential measures.—That the charges preferred against the Society at the periods alluded to, were very nearly the same in kind and degree as those now urged against it.—That now, as then, the division is *the act and the fault of the seceders*, who, unable longer to endure the odium consequent upon an uncompromising adherence to the principles and measures of the original American Anti-Slavery Society, prefer a compromise of the cause to the spirit of proscription. Unwilling to yield up the cause of the Slave altogether, they have descended a few steps from their former lofty position, and erected a half-way-house between Liberty and Slavery. The seceders, in justification of their policy, have brought the most cruel charges against the original Society, for refusing now, as formerly, to introduce any *new test*, or to become the *tool* of any SECT or PARTY.

The reader is not required to credit the truth of the above statements upon mere assertion. The strongest evidence will be adduced from the official and other documents issued by those who, once the bold defenders of the constitution, principles, and measures of the American Anti-Slavery Society, are now actively engaged in efforts for its destruction.

The question may arise in the minds of some, Why force this matter, which relates to America, and which might be left for the Abolitionists of that country to settle among themselves, upon the friends of the Negro in Great Britain, and thus disturb the harmony of the cause in this country?

It may be answered, *First*, That all associations seeking the Abolition of Slavery must, necessarily, share the sympathy of every British philanthropist, in proportion to their integrity, zeal, and efficiency in promoting this great cause; and hence the investigation of their respective merits is obligatory, and, in the language of James G. Birney, “the Abolitionists of Britain, on all the principles of justice and fair dealing, are entitled to be informed, and that in the most distinct and ingenuous manner, what are the aims of those who seek their co-operation.”

Second, That THE ONLY TWO BODIES IN AMERICA, favourable to the Immediate Emancipation of American Slaves, are the original *American* Anti-Slavery Society, which has been known, for the last eight years, as the uncompromising and faithful advocate of the oppressed Slave, and has commanded the respect and admiration of the Abolitionists of this country—and the New Society, the “American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,” called into existence within the last ten months.

Third, That the seceders claim to be the *only* true friends of the Slave, and have constituted themselves the “American and *Foreign* Anti-Slavery Society,” and, under this name, present themselves emphatically as THE Anti-Slavery Society of America. Thus acting, they have preferred charges against the original Society which, if true, should not only alienate the confidence of every friend of the Slave, but would justify every possible effort for its destruction, as the Slave’s worst enemy. The Society, however, is to be presumed innocent, till proved guilty. Hence, in order to form a right judgment, the question should be *candidly, fully, and devoutly* examined; and if, after impartial investigation, it shall appear that

the charges have no foundation in *fact*, but that this Society is opposed and calumniated by Slave-holders on the one hand, and by compromising brother professors on the other, for its unwavering integrity, then it must, ought, and will have an additional claim upon all the friends of the Negro, for their contributions, their sympathies, and their prayers.

Fourth, That the subject of this division is already before the British people, who have, through the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society of London, already taken sides against the American Anti-Slavery Society. It is painful to be compelled to state, that this Committee have not given the British people an opportunity of judging for themselves upon this question; as they have uniformly published in the *Reporter*, their official organ, statements tending to destroy all confidence in the American Anti-Slavery Society, and have refused to publish documents refuting false statements and calumnies.

Fifth, That, above all other considerations, justice to the oppressed Millions in the United States, demands of British philanthropists an early investigation of this question; for so long as this division exists, in which one party is undermining the character, standing, and influence of the other, it is evident that the power of action of both upon the great cause for which they were established, must be, in a very great degree, neutralized, and the Abolition of Slavery necessarily deferred to an indefinite period.

The testimony adduced (*though but a tithe of what might be brought forward, did the limits of this pamphlet permit*) will, we trust, be sufficient to prove conclusively, to every one who will take the pains to give the subject a thorough investigation, that those who have *seceded from the ORIGINAL AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, HAVE INTRODUCED A NEW SYSTEM OF THINGS*—things which they had, till of late, uniformly “*repudiated*” “*AS VIRTUAL ENMITY TO THE GREAT CAUSE,*” and “*CALCULATED TO DISTRACT ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES.*” Having introduced these new tests, they now demand assent to them, and proscribe every society and individual who will not join them in their crusade against principles on which, to use their own language, *they, as Abolitionists,* “*HAVE NO AUTHORITY TO SIT IN JUDGMENT.*” It will also, it is believed, appear evident, that the general questions of “*Woman’s Rights*” and “*Non-Resistance,*” the *ONLY* grounds openly and officially assigned for their secession, are not *the true reasons*; for when these fail in any place to destroy confidence in the Society, other objections are urged, adapted to the various prejudices of those whose co-operation and influence they aim to secure. To sustain and perpetuate their position, the sectarian feelings of the religious are appealed to. They do not scruple to heap upon those who will not follow them the charge of Unitarianism, Infidelity, and, in fact, every unpopular and obnoxious epithet, which, to those unacquainted with the question, may supply the place of facts and arguments. This being the case, the objections will not be anticipated which those may prefer, who are resolved upon the annihilation of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Cunning and sophistry may, by their thousand turnings,

“*Make the worse appear the better cause*”—

yet the reader, from the facts embodied in the following documentary evidence, will perceive the *animus* of the Seceders, and be prepared to appreciate their arguments, and to form a correct judgment, after a full, serious, and prayerful investigation of the whole question.

It is to be hoped, that the reader will not let the Appendix pass unnoticed, particularly that part of it which relates to an individual who is intimately connected with the cause in the United States,* and who has, in this country, been secretly, and by the tongue of slander, most cruelly misrepresented and calumniated. There is now no hope, on the part of the Seceders, of effecting the downfall of those thorough Anti-Slavery principles, which disturb the inglorious quiet of the Apologists for Slavery, while he and his coadjutors

“ Upon the nation’s naked heart,
Scatter the living coals of truth.”

The oppressed and the oppressor alike perceive, as it were, by instinct, the policy which has in itself an adaptedness to promote their respective interests. The voice of disapprobation invariably given by the free coloured people † against “ New Organization,” on the one hand, and the approving tone of the pro-Slavery press ‡ towards it, on the other, is as strong testimony as can be given in favour of the integrity of the American Anti-Slavery Society; and therefore, it is hoped that that part of the Appendix relating to the views of each will not be passed by unread.

In exposing the opposition which the Anti-Slavery cause has received from the clergy, no disrespect is intended to be cast on the office of the ministry. No one has a higher regard than the writer, for a clergyman who is faithful to the duties of his calling. The history of the Emancipation Enterprise, in the United States, cannot however, be given, without frequent allusion to the obstructive influence of the clergy, and the bare revelation of facts, with respect to their course, without note or comment, cannot but place them in an unenviable position, before the Christians of Great Britain.

That the reader may be better qualified to judge of the rise, progress, nature, and influence of the present division in America, it is necessary that a brief sketch of the Anti-Slavery cause, from its origin to the present time, should be given; that he may perceive the various instrumentalities, assuming different aspects, which have been used with a view to destroy this great enterprise.

J. A. C.

6, Queen St. Place, Southwark Bridge,
LONDON. §

* See Appendix A.

† See Appendix B.

‡ See Appendix C.

CHAPTER I.

THE ASSAULT.

"Tyrants! in vain ye trace the wizard ring,
In vain ye limit mind's unwearied spring,
What! can ye lull the winged winds asleep,
Arrest the rolling world, or chain the deep?"

CAMPBELL.

PREVIOUS to 1829, the hopes of the Slaves and free people of Colour in the United States were involved in thick darkness. The free States, by their ecclesiastical, political, and other relations to the Slave-holding States, were deeply though unconsciously interested in the continuance of the vicious and wretched system of Slavery. Every body was opposed to it, and yet felt exonerated from all responsibility for its continuance.

The American Colonization Society, at this time, was in the full enjoyment of popular favour. As it neither attacked Slavery nor the inhuman prejudice against the people of colour, but connived at and apologized for both, it received no opposition in its course, but carried in its channel the whole current of human sympathy as the Slave's best and only friend.

Under these circumstances, Mr Garrison, a young man without wealth, title, or influence, charged upon the entire country the responsibility of sustaining this atrocious system. The doctrines which he put forth were, that it was *a sin* against God to brutalize and enslave His image, and that the immediate and unconditional abolition of the system was *a duty*. This assault upon Slavery proved to be an attack upon the Colonization Society, which towered up like a mountain between the truth and the Slave-holder, and received the shafts designed for his conscience.—This led to an investigation of the principles and measures of that Association, and to the subsequent exposition, on the part of Mr Garrison, of its rottenness and inhumanity. This Society, embracing as it did all the ecclesiastical and political influence of the country, constituted the principal opponent to the Anti-Slavery enterprise.

The principles of the Abolitionists, which were at first treated as wild, visionary, unconstitutional, and unchristian, spread to such an extent, that in 1833, delegates from most of the free States convened in Philadelphia, and instituted the American Anti-Slavery Society. This Association, through the greatest opposition, calumny, and ridicule, so increased, both in numbers and influence, that in 1835, the friends of Slavery, perceiving that their "*peculiar institutions*" were fast falling into disrepute, leagued with Colonizationists, to check, by acts of violence, the onward and rapid march of Anti-Slavery principles. Their proceedings, in relation to the various mobs of this year, cast new light upon the true nature and influence of Colonization; and those who had previously stood with one foot upon this Society, and the other upon the Anti-Slavery Society, deprecating their opposition, and desiring their amalgamation, now withdrew their countenance from the one which would not stand the proof.

From this time, colonization lost its hold upon the affections of the Anti-Slavery people of New England, and retired to its proper place, further south. Yet its spirit still survived in the North, and assumed a new appearance, to delude the Abolitionists, and divert their minds from the great, and then unpopular question of "*Immediatism*." The new Associa-

tion which hence arose, took the name of "*THE AMERICAN UNION, for the Relief and Improvement of the Coloured Race.*" It was constituted chiefly by a body of clergymen, known as inimical to the Abolitionists, while they professed to be the only true and consistent friends of the Slave. They were all "*Abolitionists in the abstract,*" and professed to be in favour of Emancipation, but could not endure the test-word—" *Immediatism.*" They were all "opposed to Slavery as much as anybody," but were shocked at the idea of declaring it to be "*always sinful.*" These two phrases, "*Immediate Emancipation,*" and "*Slavery always sinful,*" constituted the only cause of separation between the Abolitionists and the friends of "*American Union.*" To those unacquainted with the genius of Slavery and the subtlety of its abettors, this appears to be a very small matter for division; nevertheless, the sentiments of the parties upon Slavery were as opposite as the poles. The differences between them were these:—

The one Society apologized for, and connived at Slavery, while it made the strongest professions of pity for the poor Slave: the other boldly declared its intention of labouring for its overthrow.

The one was loud in declaiming against the evils consequent upon the system of Slavery, but condemned all expressions which would appear to censure good, pious Slave-holders, or those devoted clergymen who did not feel it to be their duty to talk, preach, or pray upon the subject: the other considered silence or neutrality upon this question as apologizing for Slavery, and that those ministers of the gospel who would condemn oppression in Greece or Poland, or sympathize with the poor, ignorant, and degraded heathen in Asia or Africa, and yet remain silent upon greater oppression and abominations at their very doors, were recreant to the high trust to which God had appointed them.

The one was grieved that the cause of the *poor Slave* should be made to suffer from the "improper action of females:" the other rejoiced to receive the co-operation of *all* in abolishing sin and misery.

"The American Union," deprecating all harsh and unchristian measures—(*i. e.* all declarations that Slavery was a sin against God, and that it was the duty of all to lift up their voices against its continuance,) at first found favour with many Anti-Slavery friends, and those who would be Abolitionists, were it not for the odium attached to their principles. However, as it embraced no great moral truths, but was governed by the ever-shifting principle of expediency, it lived but to see one anniversary, and is now only remembered as an institution that once existed to oppose the progress of Emancipation.

To show the *animus* of this Society, the following anecdote (from among a great number which might be introduced, did space permit), will be sufficient:—

"Mr C. Tappan requested Mr Homer, an editor of one of the pro-Slavery papers, to publish the proceedings of the convention which organized the '*American Union.*' Mr Homer refused—giving, as a reason, that he was opposed to all the movements of the Abolitionists; to which Mr Tappan replied, *that the object was to put down Garrison.*"

CHAPTER II.

THE STRUGGLE.

" Pilate and Herod, friends!
 Chief priests and rulers as of old, combine!
 Just God and holy!—is that Church which lends
 Strength to the spoiler, Thine?"

WHITTIER.

MR GARRISON had made himself, from the commencement of the Anti-Slavery struggle, peculiarly obnoxious to the clergy, from the ability and faithfulness which he has evinced, in exposing the hypocrisy and cruelty of the American Colonization Society, with which almost the whole of that body were connected. His exposure of the time-serving policy of the American Union, and of its destructive influence upon the cause of Emancipation, did not add to his popularity. He was constantly assailed with reproach. The newspaper, called the *Liberator*, the pioneer in the cause—his own private property—was attacked as a dangerous publication, and irreligious in its tendency. So far as the general influence of the clergy extended, its character and influence was destroyed. It exercised too much freedom for their purpose. It spoke with too much plainness on the duties and responsibilities of ministers. While the infuriated legislature of Georgia, a Slave State, was offering a reward of 5000 dollars for the apprehension of Mr Garrison, and the Northern mob, composed of "gentlemen of property and standing," was leading him about the street, with a halter on his shoulders, the Northern pulpit and religious press were laying upon him the responsibility—charging upon him the guilt of these outbursts of popular prejudice and wrath.

The following, from the *CHRISTIAN WATCHMAN*, in speaking of the mob alluded to above, illustrates the general feeling of the religious press:—

"While we have no apology to offer for a riot, under any circumstances, we hold as *being equally culpable* those who persist in a course that is calculated to excite such proceedings."

The active and efficient labours of Women, in circulating petitions, raising funds, occasionally pleading for the bondman, and in doing what their hands found to do, to aid and encourage their brethren in their unequal conflict with oppression, greatly distressed those whose lips were sealed against that system which drives nearly a million of innocent women into the cotton fields, rice swamps, and sugar plantations, to toil, naked and exposed to the scorchings of a tropical sun, under the lash of a task-master. The following extract from "*THE CHRISTIAN REGISTER*" of August, 1835, (edited by a clergyman,) at the time the meeting of the "Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society" was broken up by a gentlemanly mob of 5000, will exhibit the general state of feeling of the *religious press* on this subject:—

"But when we come to the grave subjects of political reform, embracing complicated national interests (!) it might be wiser in the gentler sex to seek information at home, and lend their influence in a more private way."

The leading members of the *Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society* were instrumental in procuring the liberty of two female Slaves, (who had been brought into Massachusetts,) by *securing a decision* of the Court of

that State, that every Slave brought within its jurisdiction was, by its laws, declared to be instantly free. The following brief extract, from the *Boston Recorder*, a pro-Slavery paper, the organ of the Congregationalists, the largest and most influential body of Christians in New England, and edited by several clergymen, will illustrate the spirit of the religious press. To destroy the influence of the Women in this philanthropic work, the enemies of the cause endeavoured to identify their movements with "*Woman's Rights*," or some other *obnoxious* question. Its dignity of style for a religious newspaper, and its refinement of satire, in connexion with this topic, is particularly to be observed:—

"Women have rights, too, and must not be browbeaten out of them by public opinion. One of their legal and constitutional rights is, to get married, if they can. If any unmarried woman can think of any man, whose duty it is to marry her, she has an undoubted legal and constitutional right to go to him and tell him so, and argue the case with him, if he will listen, and convince him, if she be able."

To encourage foreigners, coloured people, and the Women to labour more zealously, and to answer the repeated assertions of the pro-Slavery party, that it was improper and unchristian for Women to meddle with the Anti-Slavery question; that GEO. THOMPSON, and other *foreigners*, had no right to interfere with their "*peculiar institutions*;" and that coloured people ought not to be allowed to associate with their white brethren in their incendiary crusade against the rights of the Slave-holder; the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, at its Annual Meeting in 1836, passed a resolution unanimously declaring:—

"That we consider the Anti-Slavery cause the cause of philanthropy, with regard to which *all human beings*, white men and coloured men, citizens and foreigners, MEN and WOMEN, *have the same duties and the same rights*."

Several individuals were at this meeting who have since left the same Society, on the ground that Women are not excluded from the Society. *Who has changed?*

Nothing occurred to disturb the harmony of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, beyond the constant reiteration of the old objections of the impropriety of female action, harsh language, unconstitutional and unchristian proceedings—the ordinary opposition from the clergy and from political partizans, with an occasional outburst of popular indignation, tending to foster a growing interest for the cause, till the summer of 1837. Angelina E., and Sarah M. Grimke, two highly-educated women, natives of a Slave-holding State, and formerly Slave-holders, members of the Society of Friends, and fully conversant with the nature and influence of Slavery, appeared at that time in Massachusetts as public lecturers; and by their efficient labours and powerful appeals, mightily stirred up all that was sympathetic, humane, and religious, in favour of the immediate annihilation of this soul-destroying system.

The clergy, who denied the right of an advocate of the Anti-Slavery cause to enter within their respective parochial limits, in order to agitate "*the perplexing question*" without their consent, and who were particularly shocked at the less conspicuous activity which the Women had, with but few exceptions, before exercised in the Anti-Slavery cause, could not, for a moment, tolerate the idea that women, and Quaker women too, holding, as they did, peculiar and dangerous views, regarding the Sabbath, the church, the ordinances, and the priesthood, should be allowed to itinerate as public lecturers. The audience of three days, which the Legislature of Massachusetts afforded to these women, was a standing rebuke to those ministers who professed to be mouths for the dumb. It is unnecessary to

add, that the influence of these women upon the Legislature was very powerful.

The religious pro-Slavery party now endeavoured to divert the public mind from the great question of Immediate Emancipation, (which, in consequence of the *effective labours of the Grimké's, was commanding an unusual interest*;) to the improprieties and indelicacies of "woman's bearing an active part in matters of religious reform," &c.

The pro-Slavery pulpit now gave forth its doctrines and its censures against what were termed "*Woman's rights*." The "General Association of Massachusetts," a notoriously pro-Slavery body, was immediately convened, and issued a letter to the churches under their care. The following brief extracts from the "*Pastoral Letter*" alluded to above, (issued in 1837,) will give an idea of the interest and spirit of the production:—

"The first topic upon which we would speak, has respect to the perplexed and agitating subjects which are now common amongst us is—that they [i. e. *the abolition principles*] should not be FORCED upon any church, as matters for debate *at the hazard of alienation and division*. Once it would have seemed strange, even to hint that members of churches could wish to FORCE a subject for debate upon their pastor and their brethren of the same church. But we are compelled to mourn over the loss, in a degree, of that deference to the pastoral office."

"We would call your attention to the importance of maintaining that respect and deference to the *pastoral office*, which is enjoined in Scripture, and which is essential to the best influence of the ministry on you and your children." * * *

"One way in which this respect has been in some cases violated, is in encouraging lecturers or preachers on certain topics of reform to present their subjects *within the parochial limits of settled pastors without their consent (!)*" * * *

"If there are certain topics upon which he does not preach with the frequency or in the manner that would please you, it is a violation of sacred and important rights to encourage a stranger to present them. *Deference and subordination* are essential to the happiness of society, and peculiarly so in the relation of a *people to their pastor*." * * *

"We invite your attention to the dangers which at present seem to threaten the *female character* with wide-spread and permanent injury." * * *

"We appreciate the unostentatious prayers and efforts of woman in advancing the cause of religion at home and abroad; in Sabbath-schools, in *leading religious enquirers to the pastor for instruction*, and in all such associated efforts as become the modesty of her sex; and earnestly hope that she may abound more and more in the labours of piety and love. But when she assumes the place and tone of man as a public reformer, our care and protection of her seem unnecessary, we put ourselves in self-defence against her, she yields the power which God has given her for protection, and her character becomes unnatural." * * *

"We cannot, therefore, but regret the mistaken conduct of those who encourage females to bear an obtrusive and ostentatious part in measures of reform, and countenance any of that sex who so far forget themselves as to itinerate in the character of public lecturers and teachers."

Well might the poet give utterance to the following, after perusing this production:—

"So this is all—the utmost reach
Of priestly power the mind to fetter!
When laymen *think*—when women *preach*—
A war of words—a '*Pastoral Letter*!'"

The following limited extracts from a few of the many sermons preached at this time, and printed and widely circulated over the country, by the most notorious enemies of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, will give an idea of the general spirit and opposition of the pulpit:—

"It is made the duty of woman so far as religious assemblies are concerned, to learn and not to teach—to learn in silence. And then a reason is given for it; i. e. that it would be an unseemly usurping of authority, for one who should bear the marks of subjection."

"Not only were women not permitted to harangue a christian audience, but

they were not permitted to ask a question in public. If they met any thing in the public instructions which they could not understand or consent to, they must confer with their husbands at home respecting it. It is treated not only as wrong, but 'a shame,' a scandalous offence against propriety and decency. 'It is a shame for a woman to speak in the church.'"

"We do not evade the rule on the ground that the word *church* is used, and therefore it does not apply to all religious assemblies. This is an evasion which is good only to English ears. The word here translated *church*, means assemblies of any character or description. It is equally descriptive of the small social meeting of men and women, and the great congregation of religious or secular meetings, where one stands forth to harangue an assembly. It is parallel with the word assembly, or meeting, and the prohibition is as broad as if *meeting* had been the word, and as if the Apostle had said, it is a shame for a woman to speak in public meetings!"—*Rev. Parson Cook's Sermon.*

"The legitimate effect of being converted to the popular measures of the Abolitionists, (popular, I mean, among a certain class—not with the great mass of the people—God forbid,) is a neglect of some of the appropriate duties of woman. Her time, she is apt to think, can be better employed than to devote it to her own peculiar household concerns; and therefore, she becomes a sort of travelling agent for those who make it a business to lead captive 'silly women.'"
—*Rev. Mr Folsom's Sermon.*

"When, forsaking the domestic hearth, her delicate voice is heard from house to house, or in social assemblies, rising in harsh unnatural tones of denunciation against civil laws and rulers, against measures involving political and State affairs, of which she is nearly as ignorant as the child she left at home in the cradle (!) against churches and ministers, perhaps her own pastor, and certainly all who dissent from her views; expecting to reform politics and churches, and to put down every real and supposed evil in them, by the right arm of female power, and clamorous for the organization of female societies, for this specific object; not slow to anathematize all who do not submit to her dictation, in the stereotype phraseology of certain modern charity, as 'time-serving men,' and 'canting hypocrites.'"
—*Rev. Mr Winslow's Sermon.*

Thus these hirelings of Slavery—

"Choke down at once each breathing thing
That whispers of the rights of man."

And all

"But force the Spirit of Grace itself, to bind
His consort, Liberty."

CHAPTER III.

THE REVOLT, OR CLERICAL APPEAL.

"Ah! 'tis often thus. When a righteous cause
Is struggling 'gainst its hydra-headed foes,
And seems to quiver for the equipoise;
Some nobly brave the storm a certain length,
Recede, and leave the battle to be fought
And won, by hearts *temper'd* for the conflict."

THOSE clergymen who had identified themselves with the Abolitionists, and had entered their ranks in good faith, now found themselves very unpleasantly situated. Their fidelity to the cause of the Slave made them exceedingly obnoxious to their pro-Slavery brethren, who professed to be much grieved that there were those among them, who should countenance the movement, then in full operation, not only to destroy ministerial influence, and engender disrespect for pastoral rights and usages, but that any sanction should be given to an unholy crusade against the peace of the Northern as well as Southern Churches. The advocating of the Slave's right to his freedom by one party, was a standing rebuke to the other, for their time-serving policy. Hence those among the clergy who

were faithful to the truth, to the Slave, and to their God, were held responsible for all the views entertained by Abolitionists, which were not in harmony with the "*prevailing voice of the brotherhood.*" All so-called heresies were laid at their door.

They were in a most trying position. It required much trust in God to remain faithful to the cause they had espoused; as it would necessarily attract towards them an additional visitation of ridicule and proscription from their clerical associates, who had it in their power to destroy their ministerial character and influence. They stood between two fires. On the one hand, they felt unwilling to yield up the cause of the Slave altogether; and on the other, they were disinclined to stand in opposition to their pious pro-Slavery brethren, which they must do, if they maintained Anti-Slavery fellowship with Mr Garrison, who had, by his ability, fidelity, and sagacity, detected and exposed the arts by which the true Anti-Slavery principles were to be rendered powerless, if arts could avail for that purpose. The temptation was too great, and the tempted fell. About two months after the appearance of the famous "*Pastoral Letter,*" five Anti-Slavery clergymen of Boston and its vicinity, headed by the Rev. Charles Fitch, pastor of one of the Boston churches, and for years one of the most active and efficient labourers with Mr Garrison, issued without any previous remonstrance or intimation, a public document, which its authors styled "*Clerical Appeal,*" but which might be more properly entitled Sequel to the "*Pastoral Letter,*" in which they adopted the stereotyped objections of the opponents of the Abolitionists, condemning them as rash and denunciatory; preferring serious charges against the *Liberator*, and Mr Garrison, its Editor,—deprecating all interference with pastoral rights and usages,—arraigning the Society, and individual members of it, for their heterodoxy—condemning the public action of women; and finally reaching the conclusion that the Society was so heretical, that peace, religion, and the poor Slave, required the formation of an Association on principles more "evangelical," and to which none should be admitted who would not subscribe to a certain creed. This movement was immediately seconded by thirty-nine candidates for the clerical office at Andover, who preferred some additional charges, one of which was, that Abolitionists made "statements prejudicial to the cause of Foreign Missions, and to the character of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions." The reader can judge for himself, how much occasion Abolitionists had for withdrawing their confidence from this great Society, which was then receiving and disbursing more money than any two other benevolent associations in the United States—when he shall learn that this Society, with Boston for its head-quarters, not only smothered appeals made by foreign missionaries to the American churches, but the Society itself was actually holding human beings as articles of merchandize. It was against the inconsistency and wickedness of this practice, that the attacks of the Abolitionists were directed. This association, designed to evangelize the world, was actually bartering away one set of heathen, and appropriating the proceeds to enlighten another (!)

The following extract of a letter from the Rev. Mr Armstrong, Secretary of this Society, in answer to an inquiry made by D. S. Ingraham, now a missionary in the West Indies, whether the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was the owner of Slaves? will show that there was cause of complaint on the part of Abolitionists:—

"In some cases they (the Slaves) have been hired by the month, or year; in other cases they have been purchased, of those who had a legal (?) right to their services, with the funds of the Board."

There was no giving up, on the part of these clergymen, of the doctrines of Immediate Emancipation; no war upon the Anti-Slavery principles; but an insidious attack upon its measures—measures which impart to these principles, life, strength, and energy. The document was so mild—breathed such a gentle spirit, appealing to, rather than attacking prejudice, that it mightily pleased, not only open enemies, but timid friends.

“So smooth he daubed his vice with show of virtue,
That his apparent open guilt omitted.”

For a specimen of the general feeling manifested by the religious journals, the mouth-pieces of the various denominations, edited by clergymen, and open opponents to the Anti-Slavery movements, we give the following:—

“The following Appeal is so excellent and so well-timed, that we insert it entire, although of considerable length. It manifests so good a spirit, so much in accordance with Christian propriety, that we feel confident it will find a response from many hearts not now enlisted in the Abolition enterprise.”—*N. H. Observer*.

“We have been exceedingly refreshed by the following document, which appeared in the last *New England Spectator*. Its noble, independent tone—its courtesy towards opponents, its regard for their rights, conceding all its demands—its recognition of correct principles of action and intercourse, in language plain and easy to be understood;—all this is so different from anything which we have seen from ‘that side of the house,’ that we give the whole with the sincerest pleasure. We have marvelled for a long time how Anti-Slavery ministers, at least such as we know some of them to be, could keep silence, while a tyranny was creeping in, more to be dreaded than any other now in existence among us.”—*Christian Mirror*.

A GRATIFYING DOCUMENT.—“Here is an approach to what we have so often argued to be the duty of Christian members of Anti-Slavery Societies. We admire the honest and Christian spirit of this document. Mr Fitch is pastor of the Free Church, which professes to be founded on ‘Anti-Slavery principles,’ and has frequently spoken at Anti-Slavery Meetings. Mr Towne is pastor of the Salem Street Church, and was one of the ‘seventy agents,’ commissioned last year by the American Anti-Slavery Society. Mr Sanford, and the other signers, have long been known as active members of the Anti-Slavery Society.—We publish their appeal with great pleasure.”—*Vermont Chronicle*.

TAKING RIGHT GROUND.—“Several Clerical Abolitionists in Boston and vicinity have been obliged to express their public disapprobation of some of the Garrisonisms of that region. We give a few extracts from their public appeal, as published in the *New England Spectator*. Let Abolitionists generally come out, and put down the spirit and practice of denunciation and abuse, and show a better example by speaking the truth in love, and converts to their cause will be multiplied.”—*Religious Intelligencer*.

The *objectors* were daily encouraged from all quarters, by those who might be expected to be gratified by such movements. They claimed to have nine-tenths of the Abolitionists with them. They were mistaken in considering clergymen the representatives of the cause. Those Abolitionists who had been its standard-bearers, and who were fully acquainted with the variety of influences that Slavery would bring to bear against its antagonist, saw in this scheme, only another attempt, like the “American Union,” to suit the enterprise to the level of public prejudice and taste.

But, it was asked, can such a man as Mr Fitch, who has laboured so faithfully, and sacrificed so much, and his associates, who still adhere to the principles of Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation, and who still

make the strongest professions of devotion to the Slave, be considered capable of compromising the Anti-Slavery cause with its enemies?

Be it remembered, that all who, at that time, participated in this movement with the Rev. Mr Fitch, together with the thirty-nine clergymen then at Andover, now settled in different parts of the country, have either *RETIRED from the Anti-Slavery Cause altogether*, or are *united* with others in the present attempt to CRIPPLE and to DESTROY the original American Anti-Slavery Society.

That the reader may understand the motives which actuated the leader of this unhappy division, Mr Fitch's own testimony will here be given. The following letter, written more than two years after the memorable transaction, and soon after another similar attempt was made to destroy the efficiency of the Anti-Slavery principles, speaks for itself; and therefore comment upon it is unnecessary. The admiration with which every Christian heart must be touched by the humble and devout conscientiousness which dictated such an avowal as this, is more deeply felt than it can be easily expressed. There may perhaps be no leader of a noble cause, however devout and firm, who may not take a lesson from the contrition of the brother who here acknowledges his lapse:—

“NEWARK, *January 9th*, 1840.

“MR W. L. GARRISON:—Dear Sir,—Herewith I attempt the discharge of a duty, to which I doubt not that I am led by the dictates of an enlightened conscience, and by the influences of the Spirit of God. I have been led, of late, to look over my past life, and to inquire what I would think of past feelings and actions, were I to behold JESUS CHRIST in the clouds of heaven, coming to judge the world, and to establish His reign of holiness and righteousness, and blessedness, over the pure in heart. From such an examination of my past life, I find very much, even in what I have regarded as my best actions, deeply to deplore; but especially do I find occasion for shame, and self-loathing, and deep humiliation before God and man, when I see in what multiplied instances the ruling motive of my conduct has been a desire to please men, for the sake of their good opinion. In seeking the promotion of good objects, I have often acted with this in view; but I feel bound in duty to say to you, Sir, that to gain the good will of man was the only object I had in view, in every thing which I did relative to certain writings called ‘Clerical Appeal.’ I cannot say that I was conscious at the time, certainly not as fully as I am now, that this was the motive by which I was actuated; but as I now look back upon it, in the light in which it has of late been spread before my own mind, as I doubt not by the Spirit of God, I can clearly see that, in all that matter, I had no true regard for the glory of God, or the good of man. I can see nothing better in it, than a selfish and most wicked desire to gain thereby the good opinion of such men as I supposed would be pleased by such movements; while I can clearly see, that I did not consult the will of God, or the good of my fellow-men, in the least, and did indulge toward yourself and others, and toward principles which I now see to be according to truth, feelings which both my conscience and my heart now condemn; which I know a holy God never can approve; and which I *rejoice* to think He never will approve.

“I send you this communication, because my conscience and my heart lead me to do it; because I think the truth and the Spirit of God approve it, and influence me to do it; and not because I expect or wish thereby to secure the applause of man, or even to regain any good will of man which I may have lost, by actions which I now wholly disapprove. I trust I have learned higher principles of actions; at least, I know I must learn them, or be in fearful circumstances in that day when ‘every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit must be hewn down, and cast into the fire.’

“The acknowledgment which I now make, I expect to approve when I appear before God with my final account; and this is reason enough to induce me to

make it. I believe it is according to the will of God, and that will I fully approve.

"You are at liberty, Sir, to do with it what you please. If God can be honoured, and good done thereby, I would like that the confession I make be as public as the sin I committed. I believe that I should do what I now have done, if I knew I should be despised for it by the whole world. There is one by me who searches my heart, and there is a judgment-seat before me, where I must stand. There is, also, a despised, cast-out, and crucified Saviour, who was none other than 'God manifest in the flesh,' whom I wish to please and honour. If you can make any use of this communication, that you think will be an honour to Him, or a service to the cause of truth, dispose of it at your pleasure.—The Lord strengthen you to do His will.

"CHARLES FITCH."

The proceedings of Mr Fitch and his clerical associates, threw the Anti-Slavery ranks into great confusion. The entire body of Abolitionists were apparently divided. The Slave-holders exulted, and the opposition rejoiced that Garrison was no longer to share the sympathies of the Abolitionists. This movement was so fully exposed by the Rev. Amos A. Phelps, by Mr Garrison, by Oliver Johnson, and by all the Anti-Slavery papers, with but one or two exceptions, that, after the feverish excitement of several months had passed away, it was gradually forgotten.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TESTIMONY.

"He that is first in his own cause, seemeth just, but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him."—SOLOMON.

"Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee."—LUKE xix. 22.

THE clergy, thus defeated, now resolved to render the Anti-Slavery cause odious, by charging upon it the responsibility of disseminating unpopular views entertained by some of its leading members. At this time, H. C. Wright was an agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and accompanied the Misses Grimke in their travels as lecturers. He held, in common with Mr Garrison and a few other Abolitionists, the non-resistance or ultra-peace views. This was laid hold of, as well as the Woman and Sabbath questions, to make it appear that the American Anti-Slavery Society was practically and actively opposed to the rightful existence of all human government.

It should be kept in mind, that Messrs. Arthur and Lewis Tappan, E. Wright, jun., and Amos A. Phelps, were the leading and prominent managers of the American Anti-Slavery Society; but are now the leading and prominent members of the New Society, called the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

To rebut the charges preferred against the *American Anti-Slavery Society*, by the authors of the "*Clerical Appeal*," and the open opponents to the Abolitionists, of being opposed to the existence of government and good order, (*because the committee would not make an attack upon those members and agents of the Society, who held to the ultra-peace or non-resistance principles*), the EMANCIPATOR, the

ORGAN of the Society, then under the supervision of the above named gentlemen, and edited by E. Wright, jun., its *Secretary*, in speaking upon this subject, said—

"With the abstract question of the rightfulness of human governments, as an editor of the Anti-Slavery Society, we have nothing to do; neither will our publications cudgel any man for his sentiments on this question."—August, 1837.

The same paper, in August, 1837, in disclaiming all responsibility as respects the woman question, in relation to the Misses Grimke, published the following :—

"THE MISSES GRIMKE.

"We understand that these ladies addressed an audience a few evenings since, at Lowell, of 1500 persons—a large proportion, but by no means all, of whom were females. They were heard, as they have been elsewhere, with the *greatest attention and manifest effect*.

"Yet, in spite of this success, there are not wanting those, even among Abolitionists, who doubt the propriety of their addressing promiscuous assemblies.—These ladies do not go out as agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society, nor in any way connected with it: yet, for ourself, we could fully justify the Society in sending them to do just what they are doing. It must be remembered, that the American Anti-Slavery Society is not a sectarian institution, but is made up of all sects, and appeals to all to plead the cause of the Slave, each in its own way. In employing females of the Society of Friends to lecture, it would be guilty of no innovation. We do not see how members of other sects could object to it any more justly than to admitting Friends as members. * * * *

"It ought to be observed also, that the Misses Grimke have not only the sanction of the religious body to which they belong, but they have actually been obliged, by the importunity of the men of Massachusetts, to admit them to their lectures, which they designed to confine to their own sex. *Who will lay a straw in the way of their able and effective advocacy of the rights of the poor victims of our own Christian oppression?*"

The following official document, issued by the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1837, of whom Messrs. Tappan, Phelps, Wright, and others, were members, to disprove the objections urged by the *clerical appellants* and others, will give an idea of the broad and catholic platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society at that time, and what were then the views of those who *now* are the leaders in the attack upon that noble edifice which they *then* so stoutly defended :—

"TO THE PUBLIC.

"The Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society have heretofore candidly and explicitly stated the doctrines maintained by that association, and they are now induced to caution their fellow-citizens not to confound their doctrines with such as individual members may occasionally advance.

"The Constitution, after setting forth the principles of the Society, declares that whoever consents to these principles, not being a Slave-holder, may, on making a pecuniary contribution, become a member. Hence, good faith obviously requires not only that those who enter the Society should sincerely embrace its avowed principles, but also that THE SOCIETY SHOULD ABSTAIN FROM ALL INTERFERENCE WITH SUCH OTHER PRINCIPLES AS MAY BE HELD BY ITS MEMBERS. *Of course, no member is required, by his connexion with the Society, to refrain from expressing (on his own responsibility) his individual opinions on any subject whatsoever. We believe there is, among the Abolitionists, a most cordial and unanimous assent to the great moral truths proclaimed in our constitution, while, on many other and important topics, they maintain very opposite and irreconcilable sentiments.*

"Some of these sentiments, (Non-Resistance, &c.) being promulgated in Anti-Slavery papers, (the *Liberator*) and advocated by one or more Abolitionists, (the *Misses Grimke, Garrison, and others,*) have been used to prejudice the Anti-Slavery cause. ON THE SENTIMENTS ALLUDED TO, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAVE NO AUTHORITY TO SIT IN JUDGMENT: *but, whether true or false, they receive no sanction from the Society, and every member is at liberty to assail or defend them!*

"While the Committee assume no control over the private opinions of their agents, (*referring to H. C. Wright, then agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and a Non-Resistant,*) and much less over the course which independent friends of the cause think fit to pursue, (*Garrison, Grimke, and others,*) they cheerfully acknowledge their obligation not to permit the funds of the Society to be used for the promotion of any principles or objects whatever except those specified in the constitution; and it will ever be, as it ever has been, their determination, both in regard to the agents they employ and the publications they issue, to avoid any just censure in this respect.

"The great diversity of sentiments entertained by Abolitionists on political and religious subjects, instead of being, as our enemies vainly imagine, an indication of our weakness, is a demonstration of our strength, and an omen of our ultimate triumph. That cause cannot belong to a sect or a party which is espoused by men of all sects and all parties. The rights for which we are contending, are the rights of our common nature, and their advocacy cannot safely be committed to *ANY sect or party*, nor can *any* sect or party be exempted from rebuke which takes the attitude of hostility to these rights.

"In behalf of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society,

"E. WRIGHT, Jun., *Secretary.*

"AUGUST 7th, 1837."

It should be strongly impressed upon the mind of the reader, that Messrs. A. and L. Tappan, Phelps, Wright, and all the others, who composed the Committee of the *American Anti-Slavery Society* in 1837, with but few exceptions, are now the most active and efficient leaders of the party which has separated from the original Society, on the ground that its members would not TRAMPLE *upon the Society's constitution*, by invidiously casting out a portion of its most effective labourers. That there may be no doubt in his mind as to which party has undergone the most thorough change upon this question, the gentlemen referred to above may speak for themselves.

The following is an extract from the *Annual Report* of the COMMITTEE of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, in 1837, to their constituents, and which, at a large meeting of Delegates from most of the Free States, was unanimously adopted:—

"The Committee cannot omit to mention, with heartfelt thanks to God, the important aid the cause has received from two sisters, from Charleston, S. C., once the holders of Slaves. They have, without reserve, laid themselves on the altar of the cause, at the expense of becoming aliens and outcasts from their native city, and from a large circle of Slave-holding relatives and friends. For their constant toil they have declined receiving any pecuniary compensation. Their touching 'APPEALS,' both *written and oral*, have, we doubt not, kindled a genuine Abolition flame in MANY THOUSANDS OF HEARTS. Let them hold on their course till UNIVERSAL WOMANHOOD is rallied in behalf of the bleeding victims of wrong."

We would, with the Poet, say—

"Shall tongues be mute, when deeds are wrought
Which well might shame extremest hell?
Shall freemen lock th' indignant thought?
Shall Mercy's bosom cease to swell?
Shall Honour bleed?—Shall Truth succumb?
Shall Pen, and Press, and Soul be dumb?—
By all above—around—below—
Be ours th' indignant answer—NO!"

It did not occur to the American Abolitionists that this Committee, in receiving and acknowledging in their Report, "*with heartfelt thanks to God,*" the co-operation and powerful aid of these eloquent and efficient women, or the American Anti-Slavery Society, in adopting it, were giving any opinion as respects the propriety or impropriety of females taking an active part in other departments of religious or political reform. The honour of this discovery belongs to the opponents of the Anti-Slavery enterprise. It was for those *conservators of the public weal*, who would neither labour themselves for the bondman's redemption, nor let others do so who felt disposed, to find out that it was "*contrary to reason, Scripture, and the usages of civilized society,*" for women to labour, in their own way, as their own consciences might direct, in this holy cause. Those engaged in other benevolent enterprises, and who ought to have been first and foremost in this glorious work, opposed it. The Abolitionists were united in one grand object—the Abolition of Slavery. To accomplish this work, they welcomed, "*with heartfelt thanks to God,*" every one who would aid them in breaking the oppressor's yoke. If women did not appear as conspicuous at the commencement of the enterprise as they now do, it certainly was not the fault of the Abolitionists, who, *prior* to any division in their ranks, used every variety of influence to call them into action, and eulogised them for all their movements in the cause, whether of a public or private character. Their action, on this question, like that of men, has been progressive. Their power and efficiency has, from time to time, been developed, as circumstances have called them forth. This perfectly harmonizes with the history of female co-operation in this country. The genius of the American Anti-Slavery enterprise is such as to forbid any obstacles being thrown in the way of any one who labours for Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation.

Here the Committee declare, that many thousands have been, through the private and public labours of these women, called into the Abolition ranks; and such being their success, can it be thought strange, that those who desired the Immediate Abolition of Slavery, should recommend them to "hold on till UNIVERSAL WOMANHOOD" should be rallied around the standard of freedom? The present Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society fully sympathize on this point with their predecessors of 1837, and while they *will not entertain for a moment*, as Abolitionists, the general question of "*Woman's Rights,*" they, nevertheless, acknowledge, "*with heartfelt thanks to God,*" the co-operation of all, of every class, who come to the rescue of the enslaved millions of America.

It is but just to state, that the Report, from which the above is an extract, was written previous to the lectures of the Grimke's in Massachusetts.

It may not be amiss, in this place, to summon before us, a few of the leading members of the party who have seceded from the American Anti-Slavery Society, on the ground that Women were not thrust out of it. In order that the British public may form a correct opinion on this subject, these gentlemen may be allowed to speak for themselves. Did space permit, others of the seceders would be introduced.

In 1836, LEWIS TAPPAN called a meeting in the city of New York, for pro-Slavery and Anti-Slavery discussion. Three times he went to MRS CHILD, and insisted upon her speaking. She refused, on the ground that she "had never spoken in public, and should feel much embarrassed." He replied. —"You will doubtless recover from your embarrassment in a few moments, and

you really *ought* to make an effort to overcome your reluctance, when you reflect how *much good* you can do, and how much the audience will be *interested*, if YOU ALLOW ME TO ANNOUNCE that MRS. CHILD, of Boston, is ABOUT TO ADDRESS THEM.”—*Mrs Child's Reminiscences.*

In the Spring of 1837, the Abolitionists of the large commonwealth of Ohio held a State Convention. A great portion of the delegates to it were women. At this time, JAMES G. BIRNEY was editor of an Anti-Slavery newspaper in that State, and was present at the meeting, and participated in its proceedings. On being interrogated as to whether their admission was accidental or owing to the great interest the Abolitionists of that State took in the Anti-Slavery question,—Mr Birney replied:—“Purely accidental, I presume. It never occurred to me there was anything *strange* in such a measure. It seemed so *natural* and *proper*, that THE ABOLITION OF THE WOMEN *should* be REPRESENTED as well as that of the men.”—*Mrs Child's Reminiscences.*

In America, by the term “Woman’s Rights,” it is understood that females are entitled to equal religious, civil and political privileges with men. Those who have seceded from the original American Anti-Slavery Society, *are resolved* to identify it with *this* question, on the ground that women, who have been constitutionally admitted as members, are not cast out. This Society has in view, simply, the extinction of the Slave system. It appeals to those of all sects and parties to labour in their own way for its accomplishment. An assent to the principles of Immediate Unconditional Emancipation, is the *only test and bond of union*. This is the only standard around which Abolitionists rally. All who ascend upon this platform are bound to leave their peculiar sectarian views behind them. By this simple principle, minds the most heterogeneous and opposite on other questions, harmonize. It tolerates the views of all, without giving any opinion upon any question, which distracts the religious or political world. Here Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, make common cause against this great enemy of God and man; and their souls,

“Like kindred drops, are mingled into one.”

The various religious denominations differ widely, as respects the propriety of Women participating publicly in matters of religion. One sect conferring on them equal rights and privileges with the men,—another allowing them to pray and exhort in promiscuous assemblies, while a third deprecates all such public action as indelicate and unscriptural. This being a question peculiar to sects, the individual who refuses to co-operate with a society, because it refuses to take any cognizance of the appropriate sphere of women, might with the same propriety withdraw, on the ground that it would not condemn or approve of Unitarianism, Methodism, or the principles of the Established Church: the former being equally as peculiar to sects as the latter. If one sect secedes, because women are admitted,—another may with equal justice and propriety, leave on account of their rejection. If the Society is allowed to entertain *this*, then it may entertain any other sectarian question, and hence the Anti-Slavery platform would necessarily become the arena of sectarian strife and contention, until those of different sects and parties should retire, and the noble edifice, erected for the bondman’s redemption, becomes vacated and desolate. The American Anti-Slavery Society soars above all the contending elements which separate man from his brother, and cannot, without a breach of faith, and a violation of its constitution, sit in judgment upon any other question, than the Immediate Emancipation of those in bonds. Who has withdrawn from *your* government, because a FEMALE sits

upon the throne, or because women are allowed to vote for directors who virtually govern 120,000,000 of British subjects in India—or because they are permitted, equally with men, to vote for governors and directors in the Bank of England, which regulates the fiscal and commercial interests of this vast empire? Who has refused to purchase or consume fish, because women, with heavy burdens upon their backs, publicly and in the presence of thousands, cry them for sale? Who would secede from a church, which should receive one of these women into its embrace?

Notwithstanding the great distress and confusion occasioned in the Anti-Slavery ranks by this unhappy movement of the Clerical Appellants, the Abolitionists this year (1837) succeeded in preventing the admission of Texas as a Slave-State into the Federal Union.

The death of E. P. Lovejoy, who was martyred at Alton by a mob, for publishing an Anti-Slavery paper, gave a fresh stimulus to the Abolition movements.

The Abolitionists, fearing that another effort might be made to disturb the harmony of their operations, and desiring to discourage all attempts to divide their forces, like that of the "*American Union*" of 1835, or the "*Clerical Appeal*" of 1837, at a full annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in Jan., 1838, unanimously passed the following Resolution, which was introduced by the Rev. A. St. Clair, now a member of the new Association, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society:—

"Resolved:—That Abolitionists have in view a *single* object—the Abolition of Slavery: that to accomplish this great end, we all meet on *equal* and *common* ground: that we will require of no man a RELIGIOUS or POLITICAL TEST, but hail every friend of Immediate Emancipation as a brother, and extend to him the right hand of Anti-Slavery fellowship: that we not only *reject*, but will REPU-
DIATE every attempt at *organization* on *sectarian* ground, and FROWN on any attempt to divide our ranks, as *virtual enmity* to the great cause—as calculated to *distract Anti-Slavery Societies*, and to turn their efforts against each other, instead of Slavery."

In May, 1838, at the annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in order to prevent any division among Abolitionists on political or sectarian grounds, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

"RESOLVED:—That it is the *glory* of the Anti-Slavery cause, that its *principles* are of such *fundamental* importance to the welfare of the whole human family, that men who *differ widely* from each other on *political and theological* subjects can labour *harmoniously* together for its promotion, and that no political party or religious denomination, which is not in *itself corrupt*, has anything to fear from its progress or final triumph.

Resolved:—That while we hail with joy the efforts of our brethren of any religious denomination in which Slavery exists, to purify their own church from the sin of Slavery, we should *deprecate* the formation of any Anti-Slavery Society, which imposes a *religious* or *political* test for the purpose of rendering the Anti-Slavery cause *subservient* to the interests of a *sect* or *party*, or of *opposing existing organizations*."

Public sentiment had now become so changed in Massachusetts by an Abolition warfare of eight years, that those clergymen who pursued an openly pro-Slavery course were nearly as liable to public censure as those who advocated the principles of freedom; hence the repeated declaration on their part, that they were "as much opposed to Slavery as any one." Though they had not, as a body, undergone any change, yet they saw that, in order to check the progress of Emancipation, every movement should be made with great care, as the public, thus divided in opinion,

was not easily managed ; hence they hid their opposition beneath the profession of a deep solicitude for the poor Slave, while, at the same time, they condemned the movements of the Abolitionists.

The exposure of the devices of the "*Clerical Appellants*," and their consequent defeat, did not add in the least to the popularity of Mr Garrison, or of his newspaper, the *Liberator*. He has a style peculiar to himself, by which he destroys at a blow what another would hew down by piecemeal. He continues to be the great object of offence. The modification of public opinion upon the Emancipation question was now so great, that clergymen felt called upon to make some apology for standing aloof from it. All their former subterfuges had been swept away in succession. The peculiar notions of Garrison now constituted the great objection. "Have you got rid of Garrison yet?" says one. "Discountenance his course, and I will join you," said another. "I cannot labour with Garrison," said a third. These objections, by dint of constant repetition, led those who often urged them, and those who heard them, to think that there was something about Mr Garrison that would chill to ice the very Anti-Slavery feelings within them. Not so, thought those who witnessed his oneness of purpose—his constant devotion—his great sacrifices—his faithfulness and tried integrity—his Christian and heavenly demeanour—his unwavering reliance on God to bless and crown with success all human efforts for truth and the salvation of men;—not so, thought those whose souls had been interested in behalf of their oppressed countrymen, by his powerful appeals;—not so, thought those who perceived from whom came all their opposition. They well knew it was his *uncompromising* adherence to the cause of the Slave, which made him so obnoxious to the Slave-holder and his apologists;—they knew that it was because he left no loop-hole for them to pass through as ministers, and yet remain dumb on the subject of Slavery. It was not the views which he entertained on other subjects, but his rectitude on that of Slavery, which alienated them. They, like the infuriated Slave-holding Legislature of Georgia, which offered a reward of 5000 dollars for his apprehension, thought that by displacing him, the principles would cease to disturb their inglorious quiet. False conclusion! The Anti-Slavery principles are from above, and therefore will prevail; for the Lord hath declared it.

The authors of the "*Clerical Appeal*," and those Abolition ministers who had sympathized with their movements, were, to a very great extent, reinstated in the affection and confidence of their pro-Slavery brethren, whose pastoral rights and ministerial usages had been so ably defended. This victory on the part of the clergy, in conquering a portion of the Anti-Slavery ministry, made them determine craftily to subdue the remainder. They had learned by experience that the open hostility of the "Colonization Society" towards this enterprise—the affected neutrality of the "American Union," and the insidious attack upon ITS MEASURES by the "*Clerical Appeal*," had all proved ineffectual. They could not effect their object while Mr Garrison* stood upon the watch-tower of Freedom, surveying the whole ground, watching the enemies movements, and sounding through the columns of the *Liberator*, the note of alarm when an attack was likely to be made.

* See Appendix D.

CHAPTER V.

THE PLOT.

"And Joab said to Amasa, Art thou in health, my brother? And Joab took Amasa by the beard with the right hand to kiss him. But Amasa took no heed to the sword which was in Joab's hand, so he smote him therewith in the fifth rib."—SAMUEL.

"But we do hope to find out all your tricks,
Your plots, and packings, worse than those of Trent."

MILTON.

DURING the summer and autumn of 1838, a new effort was made on the part of a few clergymen, some of whom sympathized with the "Clerical Appeal" conspiracy, while others had most strenuously opposed it, among whom were Rev. A. A. Phelps, Rev. A. St. Clair, and Rev. Daniel Wise, three salaried agents of the Old Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. The object of this secret attempt was to subvert the *Liberator*, and hence the power of Mr Garrison, by influencing the Society to issue a cheap weekly paper, the expense of which should be but about one-third the price of the *Liberator*. It was not at first to exhibit any signs of hostility, but was, on the contrary, recommended as admirably adapted to aid in extending its circulation, as it could gain access, on account of its cheapness, into many places where the *Liberator* could not, and might thus serve to introduce it.

The first intimation of this movement (for it was cleverly managed, and kept within the breasts of its originators, except when revealed to a confidant) was from a confidential letter received by P. C. Pettibone, a candidate for the ministry at Andover, from the Rev. Charles T. Torrey, a sympathizer with the division in 1837.

Mr Torrey had previously employed Mr Pettibone as an agent, and therefore felt that he had secured his confidence. The letter dwelt on the *great influence of Mr Garrison*, and thence argued that it would not be *safe to attack him*, or the *Liberator, openly*—on the great need there was of a *new paper*, which he (Mr Torrey) had ascertained by "*sounding the clergy throughout the State; and they were for it to a man*." "Now, Brother Pettibone," he wrote, "have on a full delegation at the annual meeting, at ten o'clock in the morning, prepared to stay two days. Have them pledged for the new paper, &c., and we will show them how it is done." "What can this letter mean?" thought this licentiate. His mind dwelt upon its leading features:—"Great influence of Mr Garrison." "*It wont do to attack him or the Liberator openly.*" "*Must have a new paper;*" and "*all the clergy are for it.*" He immediately resolved to acquaint a few friends with its contents. They saw in it the marks of its predecessors, the "Union" and "Appeal,"—they saw in it another insidious attempt of professed friends to neutralize the Anti-Slavery principles, by listening and yielding to the demands of Slavery, and to sacrifice upon its shrine, as a peace-offering, one of freedom's first and most devoted champions.

This letter revealed the plot which many were suspicious was in progress, but which had been managed so adroitly as to defeat all attempts at detection.

To others, letters were written, adapted to their various prejudices.

Circulars were addressed to Societies and individuals, calling upon them to have full delegations at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, to be held in Boston, Jan., 1839, pledged for the new paper. In the meanwhile, the three agents of the Society referred to; Revs. Messrs. Phelps, Wise, and St. Clair, were secretly using their influence to accomplish the same object. In due time, this plot was exposed by Mr Garrison; the note of alarm was raised, and the Abolitionists were warned to prepare themselves for the great conflict which was again about to mar the harmony of the Anti-Slavery cause. It was their design to have established this paper without creating any jealousy or opposition; and, when it should acquire a circulation and influence sufficient to justify the movement, *then* it was to bring its readers gradually, and almost imperceptibly, to their views, and thus, by stratagem, to get possession of the Anti-Slavery enterprise. But this revelation of their movements led them, in justification of their manœuvrings, to declare that the *Liberator* (its editor being a non-resistant) could not advocate political action. The Anti-Slavery question had, with them, suddenly changed its character from a moral to a political enterprise;—the *Liberator* had become too tame on the question of politics for these men, who had rather have a noise around the polls than the pulpit—though that paper had ever, consistently, and with great effect, urged as a duty, that political men should exercise their political influence for the Abolition of Slavery.

It is proper to state, in this connexion, that the *Liberator* is Mr Garrison's individual private property, and that no man or body of men—no one but its editor—is responsible for the sentiments it may contain on any subject; and also, that, at times of great pecuniary distress, Mr Garrison has refused most liberal offers to have it made the organ of the Society, having invariably refused to be trammelled by a committee, as the *Liberator* was designed to be a FREE journal. Its columns were then, as now, open to the admission, without expense, of any documents the Society might see fit to publish officially; thus giving the Society the advantage of an organ, without its expense or responsibility.

Nothing now would answer the purpose but a paper which would advocate voting at the polls as a Christian duty. That part of the constitution which relates to the object and measures of the Society says:—"The object of this Society shall be to endeavour, by all means sanctioned by law, humanity, and religion, to effect the Abolition of Slavery in the United States."* This declaration was negative, rather than positive. It answered an objection of the Slave-holders at the time it was written. It meant that the Society would not infringe upon the principles of "law, humanity, or religion," in prosecuting its enterprise, but would act in conformity to the principles of each; thus leaving each man to be his own judge as to its requisitions, otherwise there could be no understanding—no constitution—no Society. Those who vote at the polls to affect the State—those who operate upon their respective churches—and those who exercise what power they possess for the Slave, independent of political or ecclesiastical organizations, are all covered by the broad ægis of the constitution, as faithful members. "LAW!" Well; to these plotters for division, "*law*" could mean nothing in this connexion but the Christian duty of every man, his conscientious scruples to the contrary notwithstanding, to vote at the polls. Well, the "*Law*" "*SANCTIONS*" my expending all my property in purchasing Slaves, to give them their liberty; but, as my religion forbids the act, shall I be ejected from the Society?

* See Appendix E.

“*Law*” “*SANCTIONS*” my becoming a member of every ecclesiastical organization in the country, and thereby exercising an influence upon them for the Abolition of Slavery; but because my conscience will not permit, shall I be branded as recreant to the cause of the Slave? It was evident, to every “*looker on in Venice*,” what was their design. Mr Garrison could not, on account of his religious opinions, vote at the polls; and, as a clergyman remarked, we must press this *voting question*, as it is the only thing that will rid us of Garrison and the non-resistants.

The day of the annual meeting arrived. It was a day of anxiety to the friends of freedom. They did not know but that the combination of the clergy was so great that they would flock to this meeting, and take the cause into their hand, as it were, by storm.

But as this movement appeared likely to prove a failure, those who had privately encouraged it shrank from an identification with it, until they saw what was to be its fate; and, as the sequel will show, left the few foremost to manage the defeat the best way they could.

The Rev. Mr Torrey introduced a resolution that the Society should immediately issue a newspaper. To this it was replied, that there had been no expression given by the Abolitionists that another Anti-Slavery paper in the State was needed—that, notwithstanding all the private plottings for months, only half-a-dozen hands at one meeting had been raised in its favour, and by those, too, who did not understand its object. While the fate of this paper project was pending, the Rev. Mr Phelps and the Rev. Mr St. Clair raised a doubt, for the first time, as to the right of women to vote on its decision.

This was hardly a debateable question for a Society which had (1st) welcomed *all persons* as fellow-labourers, by its constitution;—(2d) had made women life-members by the payment of FIFTEEN dollars;*—and (3d) had, years previously, declared, that in this cause of philanthropy, as ABOLITIONISTS, “*MEN and WOMEN have the same rights and the same duties.*” This question was left to the President, Francis Jackson, Esq., to decide. It was not for the man who had opened the doors of his house, at the risk of its destruction, to the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, after it had been broken up, and its members insulted by a mob of 5000 “gentlemen of property and standing,” and every public place refused them,—it was not for *him* to decide that the constitution of the Society should be trampled upon by ejecting its members. He ruled that “it was in order for women to vote,” and, from this decision, no appeal was taken. The whole subject of the new Anti-Slavery paper was indefinitely postponed, by a vote of 183 to 24.

Defeated in this movement, the next step was to force upon the Society the new political theory of the party. The following resolution, in Mr H. B. Stanton’s hand-writing, submitted to the Business-Committee, to be presented to the meeting for adoption, will reveal their design:—

“Resolved,—That every minister of the gospel is bound to preach against Slavery; that every member of a christian church is bound to have no fellowship with this unfruitful work of darkness; that every ecclesiastical body is bound to purify itself of these abominations; and that every person entitled to the elective franchise, is bound not only to refrain from voting for persons as national and state officers, who are unwilling to use all their authority for the immediate abolition of Slavery, but is *bound at every election, to repair to the polls*, and cast his vote for such men as will go to the verge of their official authority for its instant annihilation; *and that every member of an Anti-Slavery Society who refuses, UNDER ANY PRETEXT, thus to act morally or POLITICALLY, or*

* See Appendix F.

counsels others to such a course, is guilty of GROSS INCONSISTENCY, and widely departs from the original and fundamental principles of the Anti-Slavery enterprise."

The Rev. Mr St. Clair offered one in its stead, less proscriptive : and the following was introduced by Mr Garrison as a substitute, which was in perfect conformity with the uniform usage of the Society, and the principles of its constitution. It was passed by a vote of 183 to 24 :—

"Resolved,—That those Abolitionists who feel themselves called upon, by a sense of duty, to go to the polls, and yet purposely absent themselves from the polls whenever an opportunity is presented to vote for a friend of the Slave—or who, when there, follow their party predilections to the abandonment of their Abolition principles, are recreant to their high professions and unworthy of the name they assume."

The Society, for passing this resolution, refusing to admit a new test, has been branded as a no-human-government Society, by the Members and friends of the New Organization, now called the "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society." The resolution will speak for itself. It refuses to interfere with the private opinions of any of its members, on any subject foreign from the question of Emancipation. The Society, in the language of Messrs. Tappan, Wright, Phelps, and the other members of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in 1837, felt that "*on these sentiments it had no authority to sit in judgment*"—and that "*with the abstract question of the rightfulness of human government it had nothing to do.*"

Notwithstanding the public seal of disapprobation, which the Abolitionists of Massachusetts had set to this newspaper project, a few individuals, secretly encouraged by the leading members of the Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, (*which received from Massachusetts, in 1838, 10,000 dollars, to carry on the national operations,*) bent on the work of division, issued the paper, called the *Massachusetts Abolitionist*; and Mr H. B. Stanton, the salaried Secretary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, was sent into Massachusetts, took the editorial charge of it, and canvassed the State, for the extension of its circulation. Thus the Abolitionists of Massachusetts were delivering money into the National Treasury; while Messrs. Tappan, Birney, Wright, Stanton, and the other members of the Committee were expending it for their annihilation! All hostility to the *Liberator* was disclaimed, while they repudiated the reflection, that another rival State Society would be soon organized. A frank declaration of their intention would have completely defeated their object; and hence, honesty in this case was not their best policy.

It was painful to behold a body of men, who had stood storm-proof against many an assault,—who had found strength to *snap asunder their SECTARIAN TIES*, rather than *abandon* the Slave, and who had laboured and sacrificed much in the cause, now beginning, little by little, to yield, to propitiate the enemy. But during a ten years' warfare, the minds of the Abolitionists had been prepared for such manifestations. They recollected that the Rev. Mr Hall, who first started with Mr Garrison; the Rev. Dr. Cox, whose furniture was burnt in the streets of New-York by a mob; the Rev. Mr Kirk, once the bold and eloquent advocate; the Rev. Mr Parker, and a long catalogue of others, whose names might be enumerated, had gone back to the "beggarly elements" of pro-Slavery, and openly opposed the Abolition movements. The manœuvrings of 1837 they had no

forgotten : and all these prepared their minds for any new revelations of change. Mr Birney now felt, that Non-resistant-Abolitionists could not consistently remain members of the Anti-Slavery Society. Mr Tappan now thought a New Society in Massachusetts was desirable. Such were the new manifestations.

At the annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1839, an attempt was made, for the first time, to exclude persons from acting as members on account of their sex. The Rev. Nathaniel Colver, at the head of a considerable number of clergymen, moved that none but *men* should have their names placed upon the roll. His motion was so amended that none of its members or delegates in attendance should be excluded, and, in accordance with the language of the constitution,* inviting *all persons* according to previous usage, &c.

It was argued, (1) that this was not a question of admission, but of exclusion—(2) that the Society had no constitutional right to exclude any description of persons but Slave-holders—(3) that it admitted *all persons*, and unless it could be proved that women were not persons, they could not be excluded—(4) that, as many Auxiliary Societies have women office-bearers, they were *ex officio* members of the Society, and entitled to seats—(5) that each local Society had a constitutional right to send up such delegates to represent them in the great American Society as they saw fit ; and that the Society was bound to receive them—(6) that refusing to eject the women would not commit the Society to the abstract question of Woman's Rights, more than refusing to reject Baptists would commit it to the doctrines of baptism, or Quakers, would commit it to the peculiar doctrines and practices of the Friends—(7) that as this question of the appropriate duties of women was one on which there was a great diversity of opinions, and was, in America, common to different sects, the Society had no right to entertain the question—(8) that it was customary among the majority of the different sects for women to pray and exhort in promiscuous assemblies—(9) that the uniform usage of the American Anti-Slavery Society was opposed to the rejection of its female members and delegates—

Because (1) women in 1833, at its formation, made speeches ; and that the Society passed a vote of thanks for their zeal and interest—(2) that the Society had always encouraged women to labour—(3) because the Society had never discouraged women's becoming officers of country and town Societies—(4) because the Society, in 1835, wished to delegate Mrs Child to visit England on the Anti-Slavery question ; and also, in 1837, endeavoured to secure her as a travelling-agent, to give public lectures on Slavery—(5) because the Society, the same year, offered the Misses Grimke a commission to go out as lecturers, and, in their annual report of the same year, highly approved of their public labours, and (6)—that the American Society, had never made any opposition to their large and influential State Auxiliaries for receiving women as delegates, in previous years.

In the course of the debate, Gerrit Smith, Esq., the president, (a gentleman who had at one time contributed to the American Anti-Slavery Society 10,000 dollars,) said :—

“ Brother Leavitt (editor of the *Emancipator*) is right. *You can exclude no description of persons from the Society.* As many women as are officers of Aux-

* See Appendix G.

iliary Societies, they are *ex officio* entitled to seats here.* Common usage in this matter has been brought forward. I never before last evening heard usage quoted to overthrow the plain letter of a constitution. Religious scruples, also, have been brought forward. It has been well said in reply, there is also a conscience on the other side.—I have been grieved at the threats of secession thrown out. I hope those who have made them will think better of it. I was slow, too slow, to withdraw from the Colonization Society. *I shall be very slow to withdraw from this Society.* You must be guilty of *palpable gross IMMORALITY, and must show a disposition to continue in it*, before I shall do so. Brother Birney thinks we should propose an amendment to the constitution. He gets the saddle on the wrong horse. The constitution suits us as it is. One word more. If some Auxiliary Societies prefer to send UP HERE, as their delegates, your [Mrs] Chapmans, your [Miss] Kelleys, and your [Mrs] Barneys, have we the right to object? If a woman can do my work best, I wish to be at liberty to select a woman."

The Society refused to reject the women, by an overwhelming majority; and, to prevent the impression, that by this act of placing women upon committees, the Society was in favour of Woman's Rights, &c., this same committee, of whom Messrs. Tappan, Birney, and Stanton were leading members, immediately issued an address to the public, from which the following sentiment is extracted, which will show in what light this act was viewed by them in May, 1839:—

"The vote of the Society, being grounded on the phrasology of its constitution, cannot be justly regarded as committing the Society in favour of any controverted principle, respecting the equal rights of women to participate in the management of public affairs."

They even allowed the *Emancipator*, their organ to declare, that—

"A contrary decision, unsupported by the constitution, [*i.e.* a decision to exclude the women,] *would have been taking sides* on a question respecting which the Society was bound to entire neutrality."

This is the precise feeling and position of the *original* American Anti-Slavery Society, up to this hour, on this subject. It refuses to entertain this or any other extraneous question. The Society now harmonizes with the sentiments of Messrs. A. & L. Tappan, Leavitt, Wright, Phelps, and all of the Committee of this same Society in 1837, and in their language, declares that, on this question, "it has NO AUTHORITY to sit in judgment."

CHAPTER VI.

A NEW PRETENCE.

"A mere disguise in which a devil lurks,
Who yet betrays his secret by his works."

COWPER.

ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jun., the once-loved Secretary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, but now unfortunately drawn into the meshes of clerical influence, resigned his office in the American Society, and filled Mr Stanton's post as editor of the new paper, which now began to exercise the most unrelenting hostility towards the *Liberator*, Mr Garrison, and the Society which refused to exclude him.

* See Appendix H.

Five months had hardly been added to the existence of this new paper, before a body of clergymen, with a few laymen, met in convention, in Boston, without any public call, or intimation of such a movement, and formed a new State Society, called the Massachusetts Abolition Society, declaring that the original society had adopted questions, which to the "*cause had become a mill-stone to sink to the depths of a bottomless ocean, the hopes of enslaved millions.*"

At the meeting at which this Society was formed, the reasons assigned for the necessity for such a step, were as various as the speakers. Its Committee finally issued a public manifesto, assigning the reasons which led the seceders to withdraw from the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. These were:—

1st. The adoption of the Woman's-Right question !

2d. It had lost its political efficiency !

3d. Its adoption of the no-human-government theory !

These extraordinary assertions will need no argument to disprove them, since the reader has been permitted to view the machinery, which had been previously set in motion, to lower the cause, by tampering with its principles. The defeat of the movers to get possession of the Society, led to this open warfare.

This New Association, now using every possible means for the *destruction* of the *Old Society*, had not existed five months, when a SPECIAL MEETING of the *American Anti-Slavery Society* was summoned to meet in Ohio, by its Committee, of whom Messrs. Birney, Tappan, and Stanton, were leading members, and in full fellowship with the few seceders in Massachusetts. This act of the Committee, without precedent in the history of the American Society, in calling a Special Meeting at that time and place, the distance (*about 600 miles from its usual place of meeting*) being too great to admit of many of the New England Abolitionists being present, led them to fear that there was some ulterior object to be secured by this Meeting, and the following revelations will show that their fears were not without foundation.

The following extracts from a CONFIDENTIAL LETTER from E. WRIGHT, Jun.,* formerly Secretary of the American Society, and at this time SECRETARY of the NEW ASSOCIATION in Massachusetts, proves conclusively, that the Woman and Political questions were only pretences to hide the main question, and by means of which, to destroy the influence of the uncompromising individuals and societies, who would not adopt the new theories unrecognized by the Constitution.

It should be kept in mind, that the value of this letter consists in the fact, that it was for private, and not for public use. Here the *animus* of the plot was revealed.

"DEAR STANTON,—Saw only a *streak* of you as you passed here. So I must say a word in scrawl, which I should have said vocally. It is this:—as you are a man and no mouse, urge the American Society at Cleveland, to take a decided

* This having been a *confidential* letter, much surprise has been expressed at its being made public. Its history may be given in few words. H. B. Stanton, being one of the Committee of arrangement of the Meeting in Ohio, above referred to, and to whom letters on the object of the meeting were addressed, in handing these over to the Business Committee, *unintentionally*, it is presumed, included this Letter from Mr Wright. One of the Committee, on reading it, immediately informed Mr Garrison of its existence and contents, who, apprehensive that it might be a *hoax*, enquired of Mr Wright, through the columns of the *Liberator*, as to its authenticity. The following week, Mr Wright answered Mr Garrison, by publishing the Letter entire, in the *Massachusetts Abolitionist*, from which it was transferred into the columns of the *Liberator*.

step towards *Presidential Candidates*. While we are about it, let's have *good stuff*. I am satisfied, the best we have will do. Let a candidate take well in his own State, and he can be made popular any where else. If* — is the thing in —, he will certainly do elsewhere. —, if he has not gone over the non-resistance dam, would do well — *perhaps it might save him*.

"There are men enough, if they will only stand, and they must be made to stand. If the thing is done judiciously, and deliberately, there will be no difficulty. Provided we get *good stuff*, not much will depend upon the previous fame of our candidates—we can manufacture their notoriety as we go along. * *

"One thing I *know*, unless you do take such a step OUR NEW ORGANIZATION HERE IS A GONE CASE. It has been, *inter nos*, SHOCKINGLY MISMANAGED. Every thing has been made to turn upon the *woman question*. The political has been left to fall out of sight.

"It wont do for *us* to start the national politics. But if the *Parent Society* does so, and not by *our* movements, then we can take hold with *all our might*; the Non-resistants will have to be out upon us, under the true flag, and the confounded woman question will be forgotten—and we shall take a living position. You certainly see this. Take my solemn assurance THAT IT IS LIFE AND DEATH WITH US. Make the move, and *we will follow and live*.

"E. WRIGHT, JUN."

"DORCHESTER, October 10th, 1839."

Here Mr Wright declares, that the "Woman question" does not answer the purpose for which it was designed, that "the political" question has failed; and that there must be a *new issue*, or else "IT IS A GONE CASE" with their NEW ORGANIZATION.

In proof of Mr Wright's assertion, that "the political had been left to fall out of sight," one or two facts, from a great multitude, must answer the present purpose. By reference to the petitions of the Massachusetts Senate, &c., it will be found, that the whole number of petitioners, whose names were sent up to the Massachusetts Legislature, in 1840, with respect to the admission of Florida as a Slave State, into the union, was 39,056—of this number, 1,727 were sent up by the New Organization, (the seceders;) and 37,329 were sent up by the Old Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. One fact more. The Chairmen of the Committees on Slavery, in both the LOWER HOUSE and *Senate*, were both Vice-presidents of this "no-human-government Society," as Mr Wright and others call it. Abolitionists are indebted to the faithfulness of these two men, Hon. G. T. Davis, and George Bradburn Esq., for their very able reports and strong resolutions, introduced by them and passed by both Houses, which *condemned Slavery* in the strongest terms, and indorsing, in full, the doctrines of Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation.

It had been, even up to this time, the policy of the American Abolitionists to act politically, without forming a distinct political party, which would, necessarily, be hostile to the existing great political parties; and to vote for such men *only*, irrespective of their party politics, as were opposed to Slavery, and would exercise their constitutional power for its immediate Abolition; thus, after the English mode in the West India Emancipation struggle, throwing the balance of power into the hands of the party most favourable to this grand object. By this means they strove to make it the interest of both parties, to nominate men favourable to Abolition, and in this mode of action they have been most successful.

The Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society had, up to the time this letter of Mr Wright was written, uniformly condemned the

organization of a new political party, as adapted to produce the greatest possible injury to the Anti-Slavery cause. The following extracts from official documents, issued by the Committee of the Society from year to year, will fully substantiate the truth of this proposition.

From the Committee's Annual Report of 1836, the following is extracted :—

“This Society has *no rewards to bestow* but those of a good conscience. *We have opened, AND SHALL OPEN, NO ROAD TO POLITICAL PREFERMENT.*”

The following is from the Report of the Committee of the American Society, and which was unanimously adopted by the Abolitionists in 1837 :—

“It is to be expected, that some *political wolves* will put on the *clothing of Abolitionism*, and SEEK TO ELEVATE THEMSELVES, and manage the Anti-Slavery Organization to suit their own purposes. But *they ought to be met on the threshold and stripped of their disguise.*—The best safeguard against their entrance is for Abolitionists, while they firmly refuse to vote for a man who will not support Abolition measures, TO AVOID SETTING UP CANDIDATES OF THEIR OWN.”

At the same meeting the following resolution was adopted :—

“Resolved,—As the sense of this Society, that while Abolitionists OUGHT NEITHER TO ORGANIZE A DISTINCT POLITICAL PARTY, nor as Abolitionists to attach themselves to any existing party, the people of all parties are solemnly bound, by the principles of our civil and religious institutions, to refuse to support any man for office, who will not sustain the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of petition, and the Abolition of Slavery and the Slave-Trade in the District of Columbia and the territories, and who will not oppose the introduction of any new Slave State into the Union.”

In the same year it was declared—

“That Abolitionists from the first, have resolved to act upon Slavery politically; NOT BY ORGANIZING A NEW POLITICAL PARTY, *but by making it the interest of both parties already existing*, to act upon Abolition principles.”

The Committee, in their Report to their constituents, the American Abolitionists, in 1838, in speaking on *this subject*, make use of the following language :—

“He is not worthy the name of an Abolitionist, who does not put the Anti-Slavery qualification above any and all others, in selecting the candidate to receive his vote. The principle of using our suffrage in favour of Emancipation, WHILE WE NEITHER ORGANIZE A DISTINCT PARTY, nor attach ourselves to any already existing, is vital to our cause.”

The Committee, in July, 1838, fearing that some few political Abolitionists would make an attempt to organize an Anti-Slavery political party, and thus jeopardize its safety and success, issued an address to the Abolitionists of the United States expressly upon this question. The following paragraphs are extracted from a circular, which was lithographed and sent to the leading abolitionists in the country. The Committee say that—

“At the last annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, the following resolution was adopted :—

“Resolved,—That WE DEPRECATE THE ORGANIZATION OF ANY ABOLITION POLITICAL PARTY; but that we recommend to Abolitionists throughout the country to interrogate candidates for office, with reference to their opinions on subjects connected with the abolition of Slavery;

and to vote, irrespective of party, for those only who will advocate the principles of universal liberty.

"Resolutions embodying the same idea have been passed by the New England Anti-Slavery Convention; and, we believe, *by nearly all, if not all, the State Anti-Slavery Societies.*

"The undersigned think the time has come, when the friends of the Slave, throughout the Free States, *should act fully up to the LETTER and SPIRIT of these resolutions.*

"All the resolutions above referred to, *deprecate the formation of a distinct Anti-Slavery political party.* We hope our friends in your region WILL DISCOURTEGE ANY SUCH ATTEMPT, or any effort to unite our interests with any existing party. Such a course would surely neutralize our influence, if it did not produce distraction and ruin. Our strength, yea, our invincibility will be found to consist, in first sacrificing our partizan predilections on the altar of humanity, and then holding ourselves entirely aloof from both the political parties. Our motto should be, *'Form alliances with no political party, but enstamp our PRINCIPLES upon all.* Thus acting and thus rallying, as *one man*, to their support, we must be felt.

"It is possible, that, in some cases, neither party will put in nomination men for whom you can consistently vote; for no *profession* of our principles ought to be regarded, when it is unattended with a good moral deportment. In that case, *Abolitionists should either not vote at all*, or scatter their votes as circumstances may render advisable. Where a majority of all the votes is required to an election, the latter course may be found wise. In the language of one of the most distinguished statesmen of the country, *'Such a party will assuredly cause itself to be respected.'*

"By order of the Executive Committee,

"JAMES G. BIRNEY, E. WRIGHT, Jr., HENRY B. STANTON,	}	<i>Corresponding Secs."</i>
---	---	---------------------------------

The Committee, in May, 1839, in their address to the Abolitionists of the United States, with respect to their political elections, again condemn a New Political Organization, in the following expressive language, making it equally as fallacious and uncalled for as the formation of a National Anti-Slavery Church, which would necessarily set all sects and parties at war against the Anti-Slavery cause:—

"Abolitionists are associated for a single object:—to change the civil, social, and moral condition of the coloured people. We believe this can be brought about, WITHOUT DESTROYING EXISTING ORGANIZATIONS IN THE STATE OR IN THE CHURCH. There is no statesman of any political creed,—no religionist of any sect,—who may not consistently give us his aid."

By the above extracts it will be seen, that the Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, whose duty it was to watch over the interests of the cause, and to sound the alarm when the Citadel of Freedom was likely to be assailed by foes without, or to be endangered by revolt within, faithful to their trust in 1836, 1837, 1838, and even up to May 1839, only five months previous to the appearance of this extraordinary letter of MR WRIGHT, condemned in their reports and official addresses, in the strongest manner possible, the formation of a new political party, as pregnant with the greatest evils, and adapted to corrupt, alienate, and destroy all Anti-Slavery Organizations. But in October, 1839, when, according to MR WRIGHT'S own language, a political party was the only expedient for the salvation of the seceding party in Massachusetts,

* Now the three most active leaders for that policy which they then condemned. Mr Birney recently allowed himself to be run as a candidate for President of the United States, and received about 6,000 votes, out of the 2,500,000 votes which were polled.

with which the American Committee were actively implicated, not a note of warning is raised against it, even though nine-tenths of the Abolitionists of the entire country were seriously and actively opposed to it. The Committee not only remained silent as to condemning this new movement, but even went farther, and allowed the *Emancipator*, their mouth-piece, to advocate the very scheme which they had uniformly, and but a few months previously, condemned. As the "New Organizationists" were unable to succeed in their work of division, by their cry against "*Woman's Rights*," "*Non-Resistance*," and other unpopular questions, they have endeavoured, and in many cases have succeeded, in changing the issue from these to the THIRD POLITICAL PARTY QUESTION.

This third political party movement had not only been stoutly condemned by the American Society up to 1839, but by all the editors of Anti-Slavery newspapers. E. Wright, Jun., in 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, and even up to August, 1839, only two months previous to the writing of this letter, condemned (*as will be seen by the extracts below*) what he now declares to be necessary for the *salvation* of the seceding party.

"LOOK ON THIS PICTURE, AND ON THIS."

E. WRIGHT, Jun., *versus* E. WRIGHT, Jun.

"GOOD ADVICE.—We [ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jun.] take the liberty to publish the following [extract of a letter,] and commend it to the attention of our readers:—"LET ABOLITIONISTS REMAIN WITH THE POLITICAL PARTIES TO WHICH THEY BELONG, but let them be more active. I hope the new organization will, in their zeal for political action, be careful not to *favour* either of the great political parties, or *oppose* them, as such. *Cast the leaven into both—WORK WITH BOTH—PURIFY BOTH*—that, in the end, both may aid and unite for the overthrow of Slavery in our land."—*E. Wright, Jun. AUGUST, 1839.*

"The principle of using our suffrage in favour of Emancipation, while we neither organize a distinct party, nor attach ourselves to any already existing, is vital to our cause."—*Idem.* 1838.

Similar sentiments were written by him in 1836 and 1837.

"One thing I know. Unless you do take such a step, [*form a human-right's party*,] OUR NEW ORGANIZATION HERE IS A GONE CASE. It has been, *inter nos*, SHOCKINGLY MISMANAGED."—*E. Wright, Jun. Oct. 1839.*

"Between *no-government* and a *human-right's* [third political] party, we think we have demonstrated there is no middle ground, on more occasions than one."—*E. Wright, Jun. Nov. 1839.*

"We must have a human-right's [third political] party, and that soon, or the problem of liberty is again to be worked out in blood."—*E. Wright, Jun. Dec. 1839.*

"In all sincerity, we ask those editors who oppose such a course, why they may not as well become Non-Resistants, and done with it?"—*E. Wright, Jun. 1840.*

The extracts given above from the writings of Mr Wright, one of the prime leaders of the division, will clearly prove that it is *not* the American Anti-Slavery Society which has changed, but himself and coadjutors. Were it not that this pamphlet is already swelled to twice the size it was originally designed, the same change in all the principal leaders of the division could be made manifest from their own writings. But sufficient has been given to make this point appear abundantly plain, and therefore more proof is entirely unnecessary.

From that time, the formation of a new, distinct political party has been the question which, to this hour, has been advocated by the Seceders with a zeal worthy of a better cause. Now, they are bold to declare, that those who do not advocate a "third political party are no-government

men"—that "a political party is the only position worthy of free and independent minds." Quotations, to an indefinite extent, might be adduced, to show the entire change which has taken place on the part of those who advocate division. The THEN Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, having failed to carry over the Abolitionists to their views as a body, resolved to drive the ploughshare of division through the entire Anti-Slavery field. They have been able, however, to carry but a small portion with them; but their opposition tends greatly to paralyze the zeal of Abolitionists not thoroughly imbued with genuine Anti-Slavery principles.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SECESSION.

" 'Tis Slander,
Whose edge is sharper than the sword; whose tongue
Out-venoms all the worms of Nile: whose breath
Rides on the posting winds, and doth belie
All corners of the world."

SHAKESPEARE.

WHILE the experiment of this division was being tried in Massachusetts, this restless Committee had been actively engaged in setting machinery in operation, preparatory to the Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, which was due in May, 1840; and at which time the Seceders withdrew, and constituted themselves the "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society." Previous to this time every possible effort was made by the seceding party, (the friends of Messrs. Birney, Tappan, Stanton, and others) to press upon their friends, in every part of the country, the importance of attending the anniversary of the American Society, to outvote the no-human-government and Woman's-Rights party, as they are pleased to term all those who refuse to adopt their new theories. The following extracts are from a circular, (and others of a similar character might be introduced, did space permit,) which was issued and sent over the country, broadcast, by the officers of the New Seceding Society in Massachusetts, and signed by the Chairman and Secretary:—

"DEAR BROTHER,—The Executive Committee of the Mass. Abolition Society have appointed you their delegate to attend the approaching annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, to be held in the city of New York, on Tuesday, the twelfth day of May next. In transmitting this certificate of your appointment, we feel ourselves called upon, by all the love we have for the Slave, to urge you to let nothing short of an interposition of Providence prevent your being present on that occasion. We need not inform you of the efforts which have been made to engraft non-resistance!! and certain other extraneous matters, into the Abolition cause!! * * * Brother, *you* must come up to the rescue. * * * We can prevent it, if our friends will turn out and be at their posts; and we must do it, or suffer a defeat. * * * Fail not, as you love the Slave, as you value correct principles, and as you feel your responsibility to God, the oppressed, your country, and the world; and if error triumphs on that occasion, let not the guilt rest upon your soul because you were not present to vote it down.

"J. BRACKETT, *Chairman.*

"J. W. ALDEN, *Secretary.*"

The Old Massachusetts Society made a similar effort to prevent the Association from falling into the hands of those who wished to compromise the cause, by making it subservient to sectarian or party purposes.

The day of the meeting arrived—and large numbers were in attendance. A second attempt was made, by a number of clergymen, to disfranchise a portion of the members of the Society on account of their sex. This also was defeated by a large majority; *women* of EACH PARTY voting upon the question. The minority then withdrew, and formed a rival Association, ("the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,") as has already been stated. This New Association was headed by the same men who cheered on the Misses Grimke in 1837, and who at that time, and subsequently, so ably answered the objections brought against the Society, of being a No-Government and Woman's-Right Society, and who *now*, strange as it may appear, *urge the very objections, the absurdity of which they had previously exposed.* As might be expected, the division is exerting a most disastrous influence upon all our organizations. The success of the new Society will depend upon the destruction of the old; for it is based upon the assumed principle that the old is injurious to the cause of the Slave. In proportion as the people are made to believe this, the new Society succeeds.

It should be noted, that two or three months prior to the annual meeting of the American Society in May last, the Committee (of whom were Messrs. Tappan, Birney, Stanton, &c.) saw, by the general voice of disapprobation which was sent up from all quarters of the Free States, as respected the unfair, and disorganizing, and sectarian course they had pursued, that the Abolitionists of the country would set upon their conduct, at that meeting, their seal of censure, by transferring the management of the Society into the hands of a new committee, which would not abuse their power for the furtherance of political or sectarian principles. Seeing all this, the Committee (like the general who preferred destroying the city to letting it fall into the hands of his enemies) resolved to cripple, and, if possible, to destroy, the original American Anti-Slavery Society. The *Emancipator*, its organ, was made the medium of proving to the Abolitionists that there was no farther use for it. Mr Birney even thought "it"—*not Slavery*, but the Society, (which had paid him about 6000 dollars, over and above his travelling expenses, for a little more than two years' services,)—unless it could be managed upon a different principle, ought to be dissolved. Again, the Committee, when they had about 14,000 dollars' worth of Anti-Slavery publications, and other property, in their possession, allowed a draft of 150 dollars to be protested. The Report of this was taken up by the pro-Slavery press, and with great satisfaction the news was circulated, that the Anti-Slavery cause was dying away, for the American Society had failed for 150 dollars.

Once more—the Committee (now the Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society) secretly, and without the least intimation to the American Abolitionists, transferred the *Emancipator*, the *original* Society's organ, into the hands of a small local hostile body, the committee of which was composed, in part, of the same men as the Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The Society had paid a bonus of more than 20,000 dollars, over and above its receipts, to keep this paper in existence; and so highly did they value it as their only medium of communication with the American Abolitionists, that no inconsiderable sum could have purchased it from them. This act was done only four weeks before the Society's annual meeting in May last, when the Committee's term of office

would expire. When called to an account for thus depriving the Society of its most valuable property—for cutting it off from all communication with the Abolitionists, at the time of its greatest need, and for transferring it into the hands of those who would use it for the destruction of the Society which brought it into existence, they alleged in excuse, that they could not meet the expense of publishing it, which, up to the time of the annual meeting, would have cost the very small sum of 300 dollars. At this very moment, the Committee held about 14,000 dollars' worth of the Society's property, as already described, in their hands; they were also paying monthly to Mr Birney the reduced salary of $187\frac{1}{2}$ dollars; to Mr Leavitt 150 dollars; and to Mr Stanton 80 dollars; and for office and clerk's hire, about 200 dollars more; making a monthly outlay of $577\frac{1}{2}$ dollars.

It is therefore evident, that as 300 dollars was all that was required to continue the *Emancipator* until the General Meeting, these parties could, by pledging the Society's property, reducing its expenses, or deferring the payment of their own salaries until after this period, have preserved to the American Anti-Slavery Society this paper, upon which so high a value was placed, in consequence of its great reputation and wide circulation among American Abolitionists.

But the reasons assigned for this transfer will appear still more flimsy, when the reader is informed, that this very Committee who made THIS TRANSFER, of whom Messrs. Birney and Stanton were themselves members, at the very time, voted to Mr Stanton 500 dollars, and Mr Birney 300 dollars, (in addition to 500 dollars previously given him, to defray their expenses in attending the General Anti-Slavery Convention in London,* and these sums were actually paid out of the treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society.† Thus, after having deprived the Society in America, of its property and means of defence, by the transfer of its organ into the hands of those who were intent on the ruin of the Anti-Slavery Society, under the paltry plea of not having funds to carry it on; they voted to themselves a large sum of money, to defray their expense to this country, and as a climax to this train of foul play, they not only misrepresent the Society at the Convention at whose expense they came, but travelled through the length and breadth of the kingdom, retailing calumnies against the Society which delegated them.

These statements have been made, not to excite any personal ill feelings in the breast of any one, against the members of this Committee who have thus betrayed a trust, unreservedly, and in good faith, committed to their guardianship; but to exhibit the workings of the pro-Slavery spirit upon their minds, by which they have been influenced to betray the Anti-Slavery cause into the hands of its enemies. The warfare which they have waged against the American Anti-Slavery Society has been as much more destructive, than that of avowed enemies, as is the treachery of a commandment of a besieged fortress, more disastrous than the assaults of an external foe.

And here, we would gladly conclude this painful subject, and leave to the discriminating and honourable reader to draw his own conclusions, as to whether a Society, thus acting, ought to be supported in place of the long-tried and uncompromising American Anti-Slavery Society. We are, however, compelled to refer to the mean course adopted by some of the members of the New Society of transmitting to this country the most base and false charges against members of the Old Society, and against

* See Appendix I.

† See Appendix K.

the Society itself,* and which we regret to say are industriously circulated through the country, by the London Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society; charges which, for scurrility and abuse, have seldom been equalled, as will be seen by a reference to the Appendix.† We cannot account for this suicidal act on the part of the London Committee, when we look at the number of honourable names which compose it, but by supposing such to have been the act of a small number of that body. We are unwilling to believe that the great men whose names adorn their list, who have spent their lives in advancing the cause of the oppressed and the enslaved, would stoop from their high moral and religious station in society, to become the medium of the foulest personal slander. We would appeal to *them* to avert this march of folly and injustice on the part of their brother committee-men.

It must be evident to every unbiassed philanthropist, that however much he may deplore the differences on this subject that may have arisen on the other side the Atlantic, the clear course for the London Committee to have pursued, was, either to have given the Abolitionists of this country, impartially, both sides of the controversy, or else to have sided with neither party, but to have made use of both Societies, wherever and whenever they could, to have severally forwarded the great and noble object which we should all have in view.

Had this been the course pursued by the London Committee, Englishmen would never have been troubled with the details of this painful case, but, as they have chosen to take the side of the New and small Society, against the Old and more numerous and long-tried Society, the latter had no other course than to lay its case before the British public; not so much to defend themselves against misrepresentations, because their faith is unshaken in the principle that truth will eventually triumph, but that the great cause for the advancement of which they are willing to lay down their property, their reputation, and their lives, should not be injured.

* See Appendix L.

† See Appendix M.

APPENDIX.

A.—See p. 9.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

THE following eloquent passages are extracted from the first number of *Mr Garrison's* newspaper, the *Liberator*, printed in 1831, to give the reader a specimen of the bold and uncompromising spirit of the man who, ten years since, stood forth as the Slave's advocate, pennyless, alone, ridiculed and condemned, and who, by his ability and faithfulness, has been, through the divine favour, permitted to be instrumental in bringing the sinfulness of Slavery before the American people:—

“ I shall not array myself as the political partizan of any man. In defending the great cause of human rights, I wish to derive the assistance of all religions and of all parties. I shall strenuously contend for the immediate enfranchisement of our Slave population. I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—AND I WILL BE HEARD. The apathy of the people is enough to make every statue leap from its pedestal, and to hasten the resurrection of the dead.”

It is painful in the extreme, that, in the Anti-Slavery cause, composed of men of all sects and all parties, there should be a necessity for vindicating the religious views or character of any faithful and uncompromising Abolitionist; but so unsparingly have the London Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society privately circulated letters to the leading friends of the Negro throughout the kingdom, written by the seceders in America, intended and adapted to create a strong prejudice against Mr Garrison, as holding and zealously propagating the most dangerous infidel sentiments, that it is but justice to the Anti-Slavery cause, with which he is intimately connected, that British minds should be disabused with respect to these wholesale calumnies. The pretended objections of the Seceders as respects “ *Woman's Rights*,” “ *Non-Resistance*,” &c., have failed to alienate the great body of Abolitionists from the American Anti-Slavery Society.—They have now adopted this new expedient of charging Mr Garrison with holding infidel sentiments, and then to identify these views with the principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Had the London Committee given publicity to these and other calumnies, in their organ, the *Reporter*, where they could have been met and refuted, instead of privately circulating them around by letters, it certainly would have appeared, in them, less mean, cowardly, and criminal. But time shall not be consumed upon this Committee. Their proceedings in this affair—their correspondence with the representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society—and their attempt to blast his reputation—all speak for themselves, in language plain and comprehensive. We shall be satisfied with the verdict of every unbiassed individual who will give *this* part of the subject a *thorough investigation*.

What if Mr Garrison is a Unitarian or an Infidel?—and he is neither. Is it the design of the Emancipation enterprise to favour one creed and condemn another? If an Anti-Slavery Society may take cognizance of one faith, may it not of another? The only question that can be properly asked by men as Emancipationists,—Is he a faithful and uncompromising Abolitionist? An assent to the Anti-Slavery principle is the only bond of union, and is the only test of membership; and that man, or body of men, who would insist upon an Anti-Slavery Society giving any opinion upon any of the different religious or political questions which distract and alienate mankind, is chargeable with throwing a firebrand into the Abolition enterprise, and is guilty of innovation. What can be the ob-

ject of professed Abolitionists thus to assassinate the Anti-Slavery reputation and influence of the Slave's first, ablest, and most devoted advocate, even if he were worse than his calumniators represent him? How is it that the Seceders, the Southern oppressors, and the London Committee and their friends in this country, are unitedly seeking to accomplish his downfall? Would a drowning man refuse the hand of a heretic stretched forth to save him? Would the millions of bondmen, stripped of their rights by professed Christians, refuse their freedom, because their chains were riven by men of faith, to them, unsound?

We could answer the charges brought against Mr Garrison by counter assertions, as there has not been the least attempt, on the part of any one of his enemies, to prove him to be an infidel. If we may be allowed to have any knowledge of the Christian graces, we should say that Mr Garrison possesses them in a very high degree. We have had the honour of an intimate acquaintance, and of labouring with him in the cause of the enslaved Negro, and have seen him in times of great trial and affliction, and have invariably found him crucified to the world, and the world to him. If we have ever met with a man who, by his life and conversation, appeared to rely on the divine promises,—whose life, being one of faith, was hid with Christ in God,—and who made it the entire aim and object of his life to elevate and redeem his fellow-creatures, and thus to glorify his Creator, that man is Wm. Lloyd Garrison. Did space permit, we might adduce the testimony of multitudes, entitled by their Christian life, to the highest confidence, giving the strongest proofs of his Christian character; but the evidence of one or two must suffice, as we prefer to let Mr Garrison speak for himself. He has been connected with the press as an editor for fourteen years, and it would seem that, during that time, opposed, persecuted, and calumniated as he has been by American Christians, he would have occasionally expressed an infidel sentiment had he entertained such principles. His accusers, however, have not been able to cull out a single sentence of the kind to sustain their charges.—We have before us but a very few papers and pamphlets, containing the writings of Mr Garrison; but there is hardly an article from his pen but what contains some religious sentiment, which would satisfy the reader, we think, that his infidelity is very evangelical.

The following is from the pen of *Angelina E. Grimke*, in 1837, then a member of the Society of Friends, in answer to an attack made upon the religious views of Mr Garrison, by Miss Beecher, a pro-Slavery woman of great notoriety:—

"I feel sorry that thy unkind insinuations against the Christian character of WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, have rendered it necessary for me to speak of him individually, because what I shall feel bound to say of him, may, to some *like thyself*, appear like flattery; but I must do what justice seems so clearly to call for at my hands. Thou sayest that 'though he *professes* a belief in the Christian religion, he is an avowed opponent of most of its institutions.' I presume thou art here alluding to his views of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the Sabbath. Permit me to remind thee, that in all these opinions, he coincides entirely with the Society of Friends, whose views of the Sabbath never were so ably vindicated as by his pen: and the insinuations of hypocrisy which thou hast thrown out against him, may with just as much truth be cast upon them. The Quakers think that these are not Christian institutions; but thou hast assumed it without any proof at all.

"In his character as a man and a Christian, I have the highest confidence. The assertion thou makest, 'that there is not to be found in that paper, or any thing else, any evidence of his possessing the peculiar traits of Wilberforce, (benignity, gentleness, and kind heartedness, I suppose thou meanest,) not even his warmest admirers will maintain,' is altogether new to me; and I, for one, feel ready to declare, that I have never met in any one a more lovely exhibition of these traits of character. I might relate several anecdotes in proof of this assertion; but let one suffice. A friend of mine, a member of the Society of Friends, told me that after he became interested in the Anti-Slavery cause, through the *Liberator*, he still felt so much prejudice against its editor, that, although he wished to labour in behalf of the slaves, he still felt as if he could not identify himself with a society which recognized such a leader, as he had heard William Lloyd Garrison was. He had never seen him; and after many

struggles of feeling, determined to go to Boston on purpose to see 'this man,' and judge of his character for himself. He did so; and when he entered the office of the *Liberator*, soon fell into conversation with a person he did not know, and became very much interested in him. After some time, a third person came in, and called off the attention of the stranger, whose benevolent countenance and benignant manners he had so much admired. He soon heard him addressed as Mr Garrison, which astonished him very much; for he had expected to see some coarse, uncouth, and rugged creature, instead of the perfect gentleman, he now learned, was William L. Garrison. He told me that the effect upon his mind was so great, that he sat down and wept, to think he had allowed himself to be so prejudiced against a person, who was so entirely different from what his enemies had represented him to be. He at once felt as if he could most cheerfully labour, heart and hand, with such a man, and has for the last three or four years been a faithful co-worker with him, in the holy cause of Immediate Emancipation: and his confidence in him, as a man of pure, Christian principles, has grown stronger and stronger, as time has advanced, and circumstances have developed his true character."

Sentiments, similar to the following extracts from Mr Garrison's "Thoughts on Colonization," have been frequently expressed in his writings, since its publication:—

"I appeal to those who have been *redeemed* from the bondage of sin by the *precious* blood of Christ, and with whom I hope to unite in a better world, in ascribing glory, and honour, and praise to the Great Deliverer for ever."

"If people would *pin their faith upon the BIBLE*, and not upon the sleeves of their neighbours, half of the heresies in the world would instantly disappear."

The following, from the pen of Mr Garrison in 1839, in answer to the charge made against the Non-Resistance Society,—of being an infidel association,—is inserted as a specimen of his infidelity, together with the Non-Resistance extract, also from his pen:—

"The allegation, that the sentiments of this Society are in accordance with those of infidels, or at least that they tend to infidelity, is manifestly as foolish as it is malicious. For infidels to *glory* in the *cross* of Christ—to inculcate the duty of walking in his footsteps—to insist on the forgiveness of enemies as the *condition of salvation*—is certainly a novel occurrence. For them to give utterance to the following language, extracted from the Non-Resistance Declaration of Sentiments, is also very remarkable:—

"So they treated the Messiah, whose example we are humbly striving to imitate. If we suffer with him, we know that we shall reign with him. We shall not be afraid of their terror, neither be troubled. Our confidence is in the LORD ALMIGHTY, not in man. Having withdrawn from human protection, what can sustain us but that faith which overcomes the world? We shall not think it strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try us, as though some strange thing had happened unto us, but rejoice inasmuch as we are partakers of CHRIST's sufferings. Wherefore we commit the keeping of our souls to GOD, in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator."

The following extract is from the closing sentence of a letter to Gerrit Smith, Esq., on the subject of Peace, in 1840:—

"I feel much solicitude on your account, lest, in your present temper of mind on the subject of politics, you should *quench* the SPIRIT OF GOD, which is manifestly *striving* with you, and close your eyes to the *heavenly light* which has burst upon you, and once more ally yourself to the kingdoms of this world, which are all to be destroyed by the brightness of the coming of Christ. Let there be no delay in making up your mind. If the Lord be God, serve him; if Baal, serve him. My prayer is for your *perfect salvation*.

"Your faithful friend,

"WM. LLOYD GARRISON."

The following is the first sentence in the Report of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and written by Mr Garrison in 1839:—

"The Lord reigns! If it were not so, the friends of humanity might despair. The Lord is omnipotent! But for this, tyrants might exercise perpetual dominion. The Lord is sworn to execute judgment for all who are oppressed! Therefore, all shackles shall be broken, and every captive set free, in this, in all lands."

We beg the reader to peruse attentively the following interesting, though somewhat lengthy article, written by Mr Garrison, in December, 1840, at the close of the tenth volume of the *Liberator* :—

"Until a comparatively recent period, our accusers were the despisers and persecutors of the coloured race—southern Slave-holders and their northern allies; but now, our most bitter revilers are those who profess to be Abolitionists, and who are indebted to our humble exertions, under God, for what they see, feel, and know on the subject of Slavery. They have requited us by lifting their heels against us, and by resorting to every means in their power, however unlawful and wicked, to destroy our Anti-Slavery influence, and crush the *Liberator*. And why is this? Because they happen not to like our views on some other subjects! Their *personal enmity* is so strong, as to induce them to PROPAGATE THE MOST ATROCIOUS FALSEHOOD, and deal in the BLACKEST CALUMNY, to effect OUR DOWNFALL. But we have not yet fallen; and, *relying* upon THE SAME GOOD BEING who has hitherto been our stay and staff—and upon THE SAME GRACIOUS REDEEMER who has cheered and animated us by His smiles in the darkest hours of affliction—and upon THE SAME DIVINE COMFORTER who has filled our heart with a *peace* which the *world* can neither give nor take away—we still expect, having done all, TO STAND. In the deliverance of our coloured countrymen from their frightful bondage, and their elevation to all the rights and privileges of our common humanity, we feel an ever-growing interest. We espoused their cause when few were willing to support it; and it would be strange indeed if, in the days of its strength and glory, we should now abandon it. Whatever evil and designing men, *under the guise of Abolitionism*, may say to alienate their affections from us, they may rest assured that we will be faithful to them *in life and in death*, and do what in us lies to cause *liberty* to be proclaimed throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.

"All other means having FAILED TO DESTROY the *Liberator*, the latest DEVICE OF SATAN, transformed into 'an angel of light,' to effect this purpose, is to represent it as an INFIDEL publication, and OURSELVES AS HOLDING INFIDEL SENTIMENTS! Having not been dismayed by the cry of 'madman! fanatic! incendiary!' at the commencement of our Anti-Slavery career, we shall not allow our peace to be disturbed by the cry of 'infidel!' OUR INFIDELITY CONSISTS IN THIS: we do not happen to agree with the majority, in regard to certain outward forms and observances;—we have refused to connect ourselves with any religious sect, and to adopt a human creed as the standard of our faith;—we do not believe that the clergy are impeccable; nay, we have dared to affirm that, as a body, they love the fleece better than they do their flocks, as their treatment of every righteous but unpopular reform plainly indicates;—we do not believe that men can have the spirit of Christ, who hold their fellow-creatures in bondage;—we do not believe it is right or consistent for Abolitionists to support a pro-Slavery priesthood, or recognize a pro-Slavery church as a religious body;—we do not believe that it is right for Christians to imprison, hang, or butcher their enemies;—we do not believe that governments of human contrivance, upheld by military power, and administered by wicked rulers, are divine;—we do not believe in the necessity of sinning against God, or being always more or less in bondage to the Devil;—we do not believe that Christ is unable to save his people from their sins in the present life, or that the world may not be overcome, through faith, by those who dwell in it;—we do not believe in holiness of time, but in holiness of heart;—we do not believe in a worldly sanctuary and ordinances of divine service, but in the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, and in spiritual worship and communion, without the intervention of any types or figures;—and, finally, we do not believe in making religion a thing of circumstance, time, or place—something distinct from the every-day pursuits and avocations of life—but ear-

nestly maintain with him who was ranked among the offscouring of all things, that, WHETHER WE EAT OR DRINK, OR WHATSOEVER WE DO, WE SHOULD DO ALL TO THE GLORY OF GOD. This is the head and front of our infidelity. How far it is dishonouring to God, or hostile to the temporal or eternal interests of men, we leave the reader to decide according to the light that is in him.

“We have been connected with the public press more than *fourteen years*; and, during that time, we have written no small amount, on a great variety of topics. We have prepared various pamphlets in an official and unofficial shape, which have been *published to the world*. We have delivered *many public addresses*, and participated in the proceedings of *many public meetings*. Now, why do not our accusers QUOTE CHAPTER AND VERSE from our writings to *sustain* their charge against us of *infidelity*? Simply BECAUSE THEY CANNOT—because they know that they are ACTUATED BY A MALEVOLENT SPIRIT, and that *the truth is not in them*. They stand self-convicted as revilers and false witnesses; for while, in one breath, they would fain make the people believe that we do not acknowledge a *divine revelation of the will of God*, they, in the next, (as it may happen to suit their *evil purpose*), denounce us as holding up perfection as the standard of christian discipleship! *We are willing that the files of the Liberator should be critically examined, in regard to our religious opinions*; for though, in this age of hollow profession and pharisaical cant, we have been indisposed to make any parade of them before the public eye, (because we wish our *works*, rather than our words, to testify of us,) yet we are confident, that, IN OUR WRITINGS, *will be found* THE UTMOST REVERENCE FOR GOD, for HIS LAW, for THE SCRIPTURES OF TRUTH, and the *highest appreciation of HIS SON as the Redeemer of the world*. We are compelled to make these statements,—though they have no special connexion with our Anti-Slavery character,—in consequence of the manner in which we have been traduced for the purpose of hindering our usefulness in the cause of our down-trodden countrymen in particular, and of mankind in general.”

The following are *extracts* of letters from the Rev. Nathaniel Colver, of Boston, to Joseph Sturge, of Birmingham, and which have been, by the London Committee, privately sent to prominent Abolitionists in this country. With regard to that portion of the letter relating to ourselves personally, as having “left” America “under suspicious circumstances,” &c., we have only to say, that, on the 10th of December, 1840, six days previous to their arrival, we submitted to the London Committee our credentials from the American and Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Societies, recommending us, in very strong terms, to the sympathy and confidence of the Abolitionists of Britain. Thus it will be seen that they were secretly circulating what they must have been aware was false,—for what purpose we will leave the enlightened reader to judge for himself. Not one of that Committee had the candour or magnanimity to acquaint us with the existence of such letters—and it was merely by accident that we learned of their circulation. We beg the reader to peruse with attention Mr Garrison’s brief review of Mr Colver’s extracts, given below.

(From the *Liberator* of January 29th, 1841, edited by WM. LLOYD GARRISON.)

REV. NATHANIEL COLVER.

The following extracts of letters from this individual to certain influential Abolitionists in London, have been communicated to me in a letter from a highly respectable member of the Society of Friends in England, received by the Columbia:—

“BOSTON, Nov. 30th, 1840.

“Garrison has just headed an *infidel Convention*, gathered from different States, to call in question the validity of the Sabbath, the church and the ministry. It was quite a gathering, and I went in, with two or three other ministers, and discussed it with them for three days.

"BOSTON, Dec. 1st, 1840.

"Wm. L. Garrison's influence is on the wane. He so identifies himself with *every infidel fanaticism* which floats, as to have lost his hold on the good. He has recently headed a Convention to inveigh against the Sabbath, the church and the ministry. It was affecting (!) to see what a company he had identified himself with—the wildest of the no-marriage Perfectionists, (!!) Transcendentalists, and Cape Cod—all in harmonious effort *against the Bible* as our standard of faith, and especially in denouncing the ministry, &c. I think the Anti-Slavery cause will ultimately shake itself from that which has been a source of great trouble.

"J. A. Collins has, a few weeks since, left for England, *under suspicious circumstances* (!!)—What are his objects, we know not; but we fear to *practise* some imposition upon British sympathy for our cause. *I hope you will beware of him*—HE IS NOT ENTITLED TO YOUR CONFIDENCE. Friends here feel deeply on the subject. Will you, if possible, ascertain what are his objects, and give us early notice?"

It is difficult to conceive of anything more unjust, malignant, and wicked than this attack, made (as it has been) assassin-like in the dark, though providentially brought to the light. Atrocious as it is, it does not excite any special surprise in my breast; for my acquaintance with the author, for the last two or three years, has fully satisfied me that he is a wolf in sheep's clothing—a bitter enemy of holiness—a practical unbeliever in the gospel—a stranger to the Spirit of Christ—and unworthy of confidence or respect. This opinion he knows I have long entertained of him as a man, and as a professed teacher of religion; for, having frequently brought him to the test of eternal truth, and clearly perceived the temper of his mind, I have felt it my duty to tell him, frankly and faithfully, what is my estimate of his character. My fidelity to him has greatly enraged him; and as there is no malignity like that of a corrupt priest when he finds that his mask of profession fails to conceal his moral deformity, it is perfectly natural that he should endeavour to revenge himself as opportunity may offer. My friends in England may rest assured that this pretended zeal of NATHANIEL COLVER for the institutions of religion, and this slanderous assault upon my religious views, proceed from *personal animosity* toward myself; nor would they be led astray by any false statements he might be disposed to make, if they knew him as well as he is known at home by those who are able to discriminate between the *form* of godliness and the *power* of it. How many more of such letters he may have written to England, I am yet ignorant. I know that his personal ill-will never slumbers, and that, in his private intercourse with individuals, especially with females, (for whom he entertains the most profound contempt as equal beings, especially on the Anti-Slavery platform,) he is constantly making his assaults, in various forms, upon my Christian character. These things I mention, not because they give me any uneasiness, but to disclose to my transatlantic friends the *animus* which actuates him in writing as he has done respecting the late Sabbath Convention, and my connexion with it.

Such is the pressure of my engagements the present week, that I can make only a very few hasty comments upon the extracts quoted above; but, before I do so, I must appeal to the good sense and Christian magnanimity of English Abolitionists in relation to this insidious attack. Suppose the representations contained in Mr Colver's letters were all true, (and they are *all false*,) am I, as any man, to be arraigned as a heretic before an *Anti-Slavery* tribunal? If I am a faithful, uncompromising *Abolitionist*, what more does it concern Abolitionists, either on this or on the other side of the Atlantic, to know? Is it anything better than impertinence for any of them to meddle with my religious or political opinions? In what part of the Anti-Slavery bond is it stipulated, that there must be a uniformity of faith among Abolitionists, not only on the subject of Emancipation, but also in relation to "the Sabbath, the church, and the ministry?" Is it not the strength and glory of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, that it appeals so directly to all the sympathies of the human breast, and enforces its claims so strongly above all sectarian, party, and geographical considerations, that Jew and Gentile, Russian and Turk, Protestant and Catholic, Mahometan and

Pagan, Whig and Tory, Chartist and Radical, may all harmoniously co-operate together for its extinction? Who and what are the Abolitionists of England but members of every sect and party in the land, differing heaven-wide in their peculiar religious and political sentiments, yet nobly forgetting those differences in their sympathy for the suffering and the dumb, and their zeal and devotion to the outraged cause of bleeding humanity? Do they not present a lovely and thrilling spectacle, thus united in the great work of human redemption from chains and slavery? And what must be the humanity, the religion, the *heart* of that man, who would drive them asunder by appeals to sectarian and party prejudices, and cause every Abolitionist, Ishmael-like, to raise his hand against his brother? Can he be actuated by a sincere desire to glorify God, and to have peace and good will abound among men? No. Can he be a disinterested, true-hearted Abolitionist? No. Does the Slave-speculator or tyrant-master desire anything so much as the annihilation of the Anti-Slavery organizations, as such? No.

I repeat it, therefore—whatever I may think of “the Sabbath, the church, and the ministry,” it is not a matter that concerns Abolitionists, and does not come within the “appropriate sphere” of their approval or condemnation. Whoever will undertake to show that I am not an *Abolitionist*, will speak to a point that is pertinent, and not travel out of the record.

Now, what was the design of NATHANIEL COLVER, in writing his defamatory letters to England? Was it to preserve the *Anti-Slavery* bond of unity in the spirit of peace, or to dash it in pieces with the hammer of priestly malice and sectarian hate? To whom were they addressed? One of them, (if I am not misinformed,) was sent to a member of the London Anti-Slavery Committee—perhaps both—but this is not material. They were written to leading, influential *Abolitionists*. For what purpose? Obviously, undeniably, expressly to *ruin my character* among the Abolitionists of England, and to blast what little reputation I may have won among them for my ten years' unwearied labours to break the yokes and fetters of my enslaved countrymen! These stabs, moreover,—let it not be forgotten,—were intended to be given *in the dark*; but the hand that was raised to give them has been providentially discovered, and he to whom that hand belongs now stands forth to the public gaze with the brand of moral turpitude imprinted upon his brow.

If the Anti-Slavery brethren to whom NATHANIEL COLVER sent his letters should happen to see this reply, I appeal to them, by every candid and Christian consideration, to say, whether they ought not to spurn this attempt to destroy the usefulness of a fellow-labourer in the Anti-Slavery field. It gives me no mortification or uneasiness to hear that, in consequence of the innumerable slanders that have been busily circulated by the lying spirit of “new organization,” my reputation and popularity are at a low ebb in England—any further than that I lament that good and excellent men should be so easily imposed upon, to the injury of that cause which is so dear to our hearts in common. Advantage is taken of their remote situation, as well as of their pious sensibilities, to *excite* their abhorrence of sentiments which they do not understand, because they have not been fairly presented to them, and of principles which lie at the foundation of “the glorious gospel of the blessed God.”

I now turn to the *extracts*. And,

1. “Garrison has just headed an *infidel convention*.”

Every word, every syllable in this sentence is untrue. No such convention has been held. I am as strongly opposed to “infidelity,” (as that term is commonly understood,) as I am to priestcraft and Slavery. My religious sentiments, (excepting as they relate to certain outward forms and observances, and respecting these I entertain the views of “Friends,”) are as rigid and uncompromising as those promulgated by Christ himself. The standard which He has erected is one that I reverence and advocate. In a true estimate of the divine authority of the scriptures, no one can go beyond me. They are my text-book, and worth all other books in the universe. My trust is in God, my aim to walk in the footsteps of his Son, my rejoicing to be crucified to the world, and the world to me. So much for the charge of “infidelity.”

In November last, a convention was held in Boston, in consequence of the

great and hurtful diversity of opinion which prevails in Christendom among the various sects on these subjects, to ascertain, if possible, what is the *true Sabbath, true ministry, and the true church*, as, (in the language of the call,) "*they exist in the mind of God.*" Is such a convention an evidence of a disposition to aid infidelity, or to promote Christian union? I had just as much to do with it as NATHANIEL COLVER himself—and *no more*. My name was not appended to the call. I attended the meeting in common with many others—so did he. I participated in the discussions—so did he. At first, I was apprehensive that the call was somewhat premature; but the result of the Convention led me to give thanks to God, and greatly to rejoice in spirit, because I believed that "the truth as it is in Jesus" was signally promoted by it: and if NATHANIEL COLVER felt that his side of the question was strengthened and truth benefitted by the discussion, instead of raising such a clamour about the convention, and uttering such abominable falsehoods about it, he, too, would rest satisfied in spirit, and feel rejoiced that so good an opportunity had been presented to preach the gospel of Christ. *Not an infidel spoke in the meeting*, the solemnity of which would scarcely have been at all interrupted, if it had not been for the violent and abusive language and the unchristian demeanour of the *Rev. Nathaniel Colver* and the *Rev. E. T. Taylor*,—as *all know* who were present at the meeting. All who spoke in opposition to the views of Mr Colver insisted upon the duty of an entire consecration to the service of God—of doing all things, at all times, to his service—of making all days holy, in spirit and in truth—of being obedient to all the requirements of Christianity. As for myself, I declare, once for all, that I am as "orthodox" in relation to the Sabbath as were Martin Luther and John Calvin—as "heterodox" as were Priestly and Thomas Belsham—and as "fanatical" as were Robert Barclay and George Fox.

2. "Wm. L. Garrison's influence is on the wane."—This cannot be true—else this restless accuser and the great mass of a corrupt priesthood would not be seeking to move heaven and earth for my downfall. My influence in the world will be in exact proportion to my fidelity to God and his cause; and it will not be in the power of men or devils to destroy it.

3. "He identifies himself with every infidel fanaticism which floats."—The charge is craftily indefinite, and means anything or nothing, just as men may be disposed to construe it. My "fanaticism" is, to make Christianity the enemy of all that is sinful; and my "infidelity" is to preach "Christ and him crucified."

4. "It was affecting to see what a company he had identified himself with!!"—If he means by the "company," those at the Convention who agreed with me in sentiment, then I have only to say that I believe they may safely be compared with their opponents on the score of "gentleness, goodness, and truth," and of their interest in the universal triumph of righteousness. There were *some* in the Convention whose "company" I should not desire to keep, *as a matter of choice*; but these I will not specify.

5. "The wildest of the no-marriage Perfectionists."—What this means, or to whom it applies, I do not know; and until this false accuser makes good this assertion, it is unworthy of further notice.

6. "Transcendentalists and Cape Cod."—What, pray, is the unpardonable sin of Cape Cod? As for the Transcendentalists, they may be right or wrong in their distinctive peculiarities; but why this sneer against them, because they choose to give their views on the question before the meeting?

7. "All in harmonious effort *against the Bible.*"—There is no excuse for a wholesale falsehood like this: it does not wear even the semblance of truth. At the opening of the Convention, and on various occasions during the discussion, I expressly declared that I stood upon the Bible, and the Bible alone, in regard to my views of "the Sabbath, the church, and the ministry"—and that I felt if I could not stand triumphantly on that foundation, I could stand nowhere in the universe. My arguments were all drawn from the Bible, and from no other source. This Mr Colver knew, and yet he represents me in England as rejecting the Bible!!

8. "Especially, in denouncing the ministry," &c.—Now, the fact is, I did not even allude to the ministry—for that question was not under consideration, and I was extremely desirous that the speakers should *keep to the point*. It was

only a time-serving, hireling, dumb dog ministry that were reproved by those who spoke on the subject—and *this Mr Colver knows!*

The attack upon our faithful coadjutor, JOHN A. COLLINS, is, in the worst sense, grossly libellous; but, as he is a non-resistant, Mr Colver knows that he can slander him with impunity. To say that he left for England "under suspicious circumstances," is basely untrue; for he went out under the auspices of the American and Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Societies, having credentials from the Managers of both Societies, and with a two-fold object in view—for the restoration of his health, and to obtain aid and sympathy for our enterprise. The assertion, that he is not entitled to British confidence, is equally profligate with the other charges of Mr Colver. He has taken with him the very highest recommendations, and, it is hoped, will meet with a kind and honourable reception at the hands of English Abolitionists. Here is further testimony.—*See Resolutions of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, &c., of January 25th, 1841, on pages 63 and 64.*

REV. AMOS A. PHELPS AND WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

"From revelations which are daily being made by the 'New Organization' party," says the *Glasgow Argus*, of April 8, 1841, "it appears too evident that its design is to destroy the Anti-Slavery influence, not only in America, but in this country also, of that bold and uncompromising apostle of American Abolition, William Lloyd Garrison. To effect this purpose, the Rev. A. A. Phelps, a leader among the Seceders, has grouped together the extracts from the speeches of a few individuals,—which must be deprecated by every friend of Christianity,—delivered at a Convention recently held in Boston, to discuss the Sabbath question; and then, by some magic turn, leaves the reader to infer that these are the views of Mr Garrison. This article was published in the *New England Christian Advocate*, and has been sent to the leading Abolitionists of Great Britain, and it has, we are informed, greatly injured Mr Garrison and the Society with which he is connected. We, therefore, deem it an act of justice to the cause with which Mr Garrison is so intimately connected, to give place to his rejoinder in our columns," &c. We regret our inability to insert this article of Mr Phelps', on account of its extreme length. A perusal of it to a liberal and enlightened reader, would supercede the necessity of comments from us. Besides, we prefer to let the reader hear both sides of a question, that he may form an opinion intelligently.

The obvious design of Mr Phelps, evidently, was to prove that those who joined the Convention were infidels; and then, with a poet's license, sweeps his arms across the Atlantic, and groups me with the "infidel" speakers of the Convention. Words are put into my mouth which never escaped my lips. Mr Phelps makes me to say, that the only qualification necessary to become a member of a Christian Church, is "Garrison Abolition." I do not consider it necessary, in this connexion, to burden the Anti-Slavery reader with a detail of my religious opinions. I hold Christian doctrine to be of great importance, but Christian practice to be equally important. I do not consider the Anti-Slavery cause competent to approve or condemn my religious tenets; but when the religious body with which I am connected feels disposed to summon me before its tribunal for heresy, I shall be most happy to give it all the information respecting my faith, which it may have a right to demand.

The following rejoinder to Mr Phelps, appeared in the *Liberator*, Boston, March 12, 1841. Mr Garrison will review the article in the "*Advocate*," provided its columns are not closed against him. We will then see if the Seceders will be as active in inundating Great Britain with the antidote, as the poison.

INFIDELITY.

"If Amos A. Phelps is determined to dig his own pit, and to insure for himself an ignominious burial, he can blame no one but himself; and if Nathaniel Colver chooses

to make Mr Phelps his champion, to save him from utter condemnation for his unprincipled conduct, I shall be among the last to complain. They are perfectly conscious that they have lost the respect and confidence of the great body of Abolitionists in this Commonwealth; and hence it is that they act like men who are desperate in spirit. I warn them not to persist in their insane course—to look well to their footsteps—to cease acting the part of schismatics in the Anti-Slavery ranks—to count the costs of that warfare which they have begun to wage against the reformatory spirit of the times. Let them beware how they make the *priest* distinct from and superior to the *man*. Let them be assured that, though cunning, and tact, and jesuitism, may succeed for a time, truth must be victor in the end, and innocence shall be vindicated in the eyes of the universe.

"In the *New England Christian Advocate*, of Feb. —, (edited by Luther Lee, and published at Lowell,) Mr Phelps has undertaken to prove, in an article occupying nearly a page of that paper, that the late Sabbatical Convention in Boston was an 'infidel' one; that all who joined it as members were 'infidels;' that, among those who acted a conspicuous part as 'infidels,' on that occasion, were Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Boston, and Rev. Mr. Parker of Roxbury, and Messrs. Alcott, Dyer, Whiting, Brown, and others; and that the slanderous charges brought against me in Mr Colver's letters to Joseph Sturge are all true to the letter!!! I would here state, that I have regularly received every number of the *Advocate*, except the one containing the attack upon me by Mr Phelps; nor have I now a copy of it in my possession, but it is solely owing to the kindness of a friend that I am indebted for a perusal of it. Whether there has been any design in this omission, I cannot tell; but I will thank Mr Lee, or any one else, to send me a copy without delay; for I wish to make a reply to it through the columns of the *Advocate*; and if in that reply I fail to prove that Mr Phelps has acted the part of a slanderer and a jesuit, then let me be subjected to derision, and covered with infamy. In all my readings, I have never seen any thing more unfair, more ludicrous, or more impudent, in controversy. The argument itself is ludicrous, but the spirit is obviously malignant, and the whole article remarkable for its bold effrontery. I shall take it for granted that Mr Lee will allow me to be heard in the *Advocate*, to the extent of the space that has been occupied by Mr Phelps.

"In my reply to the charges of Nathaniel Colver, I said—'I am as strongly opposed to infidelity, as that term is commonly understood, as I am to priestcraft and slavery.' Was it possible for me to have been more explicit? I further said—'My religious sentiments are as rigid and uncompromising as those promulgated by Christ himself. The standard that he has erected is one that I reverence and advocate. In a true estimate of the divine authority of the scriptures, no one can go beyond me. They are my text-book, and worth all other books in the universe. My trust is in God, my aim to walk in the footsteps of his Son, &c., &c.'

"All this, says Mr Phelps, looks very fair—but what does it mean? I do not marvel that one, whom I am constrained to regard as ignorant of the light, and life, and spirit of the gospel of Christ, and who is disposed to cling to that old covenant 'which gendereth to bondage,' is unable to perceive or understand the meaning of these declarations: but what I marvel at is this—that, whether I mean precisely by them what he does or not, he should be so rash and foolish as to attempt to identify them as infidel sentiments! In his apostacy from the Anti-Slavery ranks, has he lost his reason? Do 'infidels' affect to reverence and advocate Christianity? Do they place the Bible in value above all other books in the world? Do they talk of trusting in God, and of glorifying in the cross of Christ? Strange 'infidelity' this!!

"The outrageous injustice of Mr Phelps consists, first, in giving detached passages from the speeches of several individuals who addressed that Convention—and, secondly, in making me responsible for these passages. Now, I protest against this course as being devoid of candour, and such as no honest-minded man would pursue. I choose to hold myself responsible only for the sentiments that I may utter or endorse. Those which Mr Phelps has selected he knows I neither uttered nor endorsed in the Convention. He knows, too, and is forced to confess, that I made the Bible my standard, and nothing else; that all my arguments were based upon the Bible; and that I expressly said, that I did not see how those, who rejected the Bible, could enter into the Sabbatical question, because nothing is definitely known of a Sabbath except from the Bible. And yet I am an 'infidel,' and 'in harmonious effort with Transcendentalists, the wildest of the no-marriage Perfectionists, &c., &c., against the Bible as our standard of faith'!!

"But this is not the worst of the story. With almost Satanic malice, (so it seems to me,) Mr. Phelps pretends to give the views of certain individuals respecting marriage, and represents them as being in favour of the abrogation of the marriage institution; and then he leads the reader to infer that I sympathize with such abominable sentiments!! True, he does not dare to make any direct charge; nay, he is so charitable as to presume that I am not yet prepared to go so far; but it must be apparent to the dullest vision, that it was the design of Mr Phelps to have the inference drawn by the reader, that, because I happen to agree with those individuals on a particular topic, therefore I must necessarily agree with them in all their other sentiments! If he did not mean all this, why did he take the pains to travel so far out of the record? What a beautiful specimen of priestly candour and magnanimity! In this manner, how

easily one can stab the moral character of another! Yet who, but an assassin in spirit, would be guilty of such base conduct? Believing that my views of the Sabbath are scriptural—that they are essential to the progress of a pure gospel—that they cannot be successfully controverted, and will ultimately become universal, to the utter overthrow of all priesthood, superstition, and false worship—I care not, and do not stop to ask, who is with or who against me. Whoever receives my views, on that subject, I believe will receive what the Bible teaches, and what the Holy Spirit bears witness to, in that particular; and so far he will be right, however loose or heretical he may be on other subjects. Is Mr Phelps prepared to be judged by his own standard—that, because a good and a bad man may accord in opinion on a given point, therefore they must harmonize in all other things? Now, if am to be associated, *volens volens*, with those who would abrogate marriage, because they and I reject the dogma, that one day is more holy than another; then, as I agree in this matter with Luther, with Calvin, with Paley, with Priestly, with Barclay, and a host of other men, who were supposed (at least by the various sects to which they belonged) to have stood within the pale of Christianity, let us hear no more about morality or piety, but let them be ranked with ‘the wildest of the no-marriage Perfectionists’—with the vilest of the vile!

“Mr Phelps may pretend to believe that my religious sentiments ‘tend’ to the overthrow of marriage—for this is the artful form in which his profligate insinuations are made. So it is said that the sentiments of Abolitionists tend to insurrection and murder—and those of non-resistants to anarchy and jacobinism! But such sayings are more worthy of an inmate of Bedlam, than of a rational and sound mind. The marriage institution I have ever held to be sacred, and I am sure that its overthrow would make our earth a hell; and in my Lectures upon Slavery, if there be one topic that I have dwelt upon more particularly than another, it is the awful fact that, by that impious system, millions of our race are denied the rights of marriage, and are compelled to herd together like mere animals. That the marriage institution is most shockingly perverted, no one can doubt. I am for its preservation, its purification, its perpetuity.

“Whoever reports that the late Sabbath Convention was composed of infidels, is guilty of uttering falsehood. Its members were Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Friends, Unitarians, &c., &c.; and nearly all of them Abolitionists. All persons were invited to it, and, of course, the assembly was as promiscuous as an Anti-Slavery or a temperance gathering. I have asserted that no infidels spoke in the meeting, using the term in its usual acceptation—viz., no one, avowing himself to be an infidel of the ‘Fanny Wright school.’ This statement is perfectly accurate; yet, to disprove it, Mr Phelps undertakes to show that the Rev. Mr Parker and others uttered sentiments which he regards as infidel—ergo, it was an ‘infidel Convention!’ Then, because Mr Phelps addressed it, it was an ‘orthodox Convention’—and when Mr Colver spoke, it was a ‘Baptist Convention’—and when Mr Taylor spoke, it was a ‘Methodist Convention.’!!! But the Convention, as such, endorsed no man’s sentiments, and took no action upon the Sabbath question *pro or con*.”—*Liberator*, Boston, March 12, 1841.

The following resolution was passed at the Annual Meeting of the Worcester County North Division Anti-Slavery Society, held in Holden, Feb. 18th, 1841.

“Resolved, That the recent attempt of the Rev. Nathaniel Colver, of Boston, to destroy, in England, the Anti-Slavery reputation and influence of our unfaltering coadjutors, John A. Collins and William L. Garrison, by slanderously assailing their moral and religious character in private letters, addressed to certain influential Abolitionists in that Country, is regarded by this Society as in a high degree flagrant and unjustifiable, and worthy of universal reprobation.”

The following resolutions were passed at the Annual Meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society, held in Georgetown, February 25th, 1841.

“Resolved, That we view, with indignation, the attempt recently made by Nathaniel Colver, of Boston, to impeach the character of our beloved brother, William Lloyd Garrison, before the Abolitionists of Great Britain, by alleging against him charges *false in fact*, as well as pertaining to subjects upon which we, as Abolitionists, cannot rightfully take cognizance.”

“Resolved, That we regard with the same feelings, the unjustifiable attack of the same individual upon our beloved brother, John A. Collins, whose moral integrity stands unimpeached.”

TESTIMONY OF JAMES CANNINGS FULLER.

James Cannings Fuller, of the United States, (formerly of England,) an orthodox minister of the Friends’ Society, has, in answer to inquiries made by a Friend in this country, as to the truth of the statements in the extracts from the Rev. Mr

Colver's letters, on pages 45, 46, written a letter, in which he speaks in the highest terms of the Christian character of Wm. Lloyd Garrison. Mr Fuller says:—

"I should not hesitate to declare as my judgment, that there is no man in America, whose faith is more deeply founded on the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, as exhibited in the holy Scriptures, or who has a more abiding sense of his duty towards God and his fellow-men, under those principles, than William Lloyd Garrison. Most sincerely and honestly do I believe, there is not the slightest ground for the charges of Nathaniel Colver against either Garrison or Collins." J. C. Fuller has also "forwarded to the editor of the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter*, which has been refused admission, a letter, accompanied with resolutions, supported by four orthodox ministers, and unanimously adopted by a convention of 300 Abolitionists," relating to these extracts.

We will close this part of the subject, by inserting the lines addressed to Mr Garrison by the poet Whittier:—

TO WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

CHAMPION of those who groan beneath
Oppression's iron hand:
In view of penury, hate, and death,
I see thee fearless stand.
Still bearing up thy lofty brow,
In the steadfast strength of truth,
In manhood sealing well the vow
And promise of thy youth.

Go on!—for thou hast chosen well;
On in the strength of God!
Long as one human heart shall swell
Beneath the tyrant's rod.
Speak in a slumbering nation's ear,
As thou hast ever spoken,
Until the dead in sin shall hear—
The fetter's link be broken!

I love thee with a brother's love,
I feel my pulses thrill,
To mark thy spirit soar above
The cloud of human ill.
My heart hath leaped to answer thine,
And echo back thy words,
As leaps the warriors at the shine
And flash of kindred swords!

They tell me thou art rash and vain—
A searcher after fame—
That thou art striving but to gain
A long-enduring name—
That thou hast nerved the Afric's hand,
And steeled the Afric's heart,
To shake aloft his vengeful brand,
And rend his chain apart.

Have I not known thee well, and read
Thy mighty purpose long!
And watched the trials which have made
Thy human spirit strong?
And shall the *slanderer's demon breath*
Avail with one like me,
To dim the *sunshine of my faith*,
And earnest trust in thee?

Go on—the dagger's point may glare
Amid thy pathway's gloom—
The fate which sternly threatens there,
Is glorious martyrdom!
Then onward with a *martyr's zeal*—
Press on to thy reward—
The hour when man shall only kneel,
Before his Father—God.

B.—See page 9.

VOICE OF THE COLOURED PEOPLE.

A few, as a specimen, of the many resolutions passed by the free coloured people, in different parts of the United States, are here inserted, in which their confidence is strongly expressed in Mr Garrison and the old organization, and their unqualified condemnation of the seceding party.

At a very large adjourned meeting of the Coloured citizens of Boston, October 17th, to take into consideration the object, nature, and influence of new organization, the following resolutions were passed:—

"Resolved, That we consider it a religious duty to defend Mr Garrison against every attempt, whether of internal or external foes, to crush him.

"Resolved, That we hail with joy the fact, that unshaken confidence is reposed in our highly esteemed fellow-citizen, William Lloyd Garrison, by the coloured people in New Bedford, Worcester, Salem, and elsewhere in this commonwealth, and regard it as a further proof of their discernment and love of pure principles,

"Resolved, That we believe it is now made manifest to every coloured person, that the design of the new organization is the entire overthrow of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society : and that no artifice is left untried to effect that purpose ; and therefore that it ought to be regarded with more jealousy than even the Colonization Society itself.

"Resolved, That all Coloured people who are acquainted with the present aspect of the Anti-Slavery cause in this State, and who enlist with those who seek the overthrow of Garrison and his coadjutors, are enemies to the true interest of the Slave, and ought to be treated as such ; for no dependence can be placed upon them ; if they will betray one man, they are very likely to do so to another.

"THOMAS HENSON, *Chairman*.

"WM. C. NELL, *Secretary*."

At a large and respectable meeting, held by the Coloured people in New Bedford, May 25th, 1840, Solomon Peneton was called to the Chair, and J. B. Sanderson appointed Secretary. N. A. Borden and Paul C. Howard, on the part of a committee, presented the following resolutions, which after an animated discussion, were unanimously adopted :—

"Resolved, That we cannot but express our unaffected joy and gratitude to God, for the success that attended the American Anti-Slavery Society, at the last annual meeting, in its determination to adhere to original and pure Anti-Slavery principles ; and we regard it as a signal triumph of liberty and truth, over intolerance, sectarianism and error.

"Resolved, That the prompt manner in which our coloured friends in this and the NEIGHBOURING STATES RESPONDED to the call and came up to the rescue, augurs well for their Anti-Slavery zeal ; and no doubt they find a rich reward in the consciousness of having done their duty in a righteous cause.

"Resolved, That the spirit which leads to 'new organization,' because females are allowed to speak and act in a holy cause as duty dictates, is the foul spirit of prejudice ; and as its tendency is to exclude a large portion of the well-tried friends of the Slave, on account of their sex, we should not be surprised if its next step is to exclude another portion on account of colour.

"Resolved, That the word 'FOREIGN' in the name of the New Society lately formed at New York, is a significant word, rightly expressing the principles upon which it is based, viz. : that they are as *foreign* to freedom and equality, as the Slave code of Georgia is to the Declaration of American Independence.

"S. PENETON, *Chairman*.

"J. B. SANDERSON, *Secretary*."

The following extract from a speech of Mr Remond, the intelligent and eloquent Coloured delegate from the United States, to the General Anti-Slavery Convention in London, delivered at a large public meeting in Darlington, January 27th, 1841, will show what organization has the confidence of the coloured people of America :—

"He considered it most unjust to desert that Society longest known and most faithfully tried in the fiery ordeal of suffering and proscription, and which had for the last eight years stood storm-proof against every species of opposition. He felt that the English friends had committed themselves to what was called new organization, prematurely, and that too, from ex-parte statements. He felt free to declare, that up to that hour, the expression of the free people of colour, so far as any had been made, was in favour of the original American Anti-Slavery Society. He considered the decision of the coloured people the best thermometer to enable the meeting to form a judgment as to the rise and fall of genuine Abolition. For the undiminished regard they had for those bold, true, and fearless advocates of their cause, Wm. Lloyd Garrison and N. P. Rogers, he would refer the audience to their reception in Boston, on their return from this country a short time since, by the coloured people of that city."

Upon the return of Wm. Lloyd Garrison and N. P. Rogers to America, from England, in August, 1840, the Coloured citizens of Boston called a public meeting, at which about two thousand of every complexion were present, to give them a cordial reception, as their tried friends and the faithful advocates of "old organization" principles.

Mr Hilton, in introducing Mr Garrison, to that large assembly, made use of the following language, which expressed the feelings of his coloured brethren :—

"MY WELL-BELOVED FRIEND AND BROTHER,—

"Ten years have well nigh elapsed, since it was my happy lot, in conjunction with the chairman of this meeting, to greet your first entrance into the city of Boston, and

to give you a hearty welcome, as our organ—as an exponent of the feelings of the coloured people.

“It has become my pleasing task again to give you a most cordial welcome on the part of the same people, on your return from what is called the World’s Convention; falsely so called. Your advocacy of the glorious principles of Immediate Emancipation, for which you have suffered so much, has greatly endeared you to the hearts of this people. They have come forth, as you see, to give you a cordial welcome.

“They well remember that William Lloyd Garrison, was the first who raised his voice in America, in favour of Immediate Emancipation; and it is William Lloyd Garrison whom they still find their boldest champion.

“Whilst the pulpit was dumb, you, Sir, lifted up your voice in our behalf like a man! (Applause)—and lest editors may conceive themselves slighted, I will remark that they also were dumb; while your voice was raised in a manner the most determined and persevering. They well remember your ‘Thoughts on Colonization;’ your predictions of what would befall you in consequence of attacking that rotten system. They remember the noble pledges that you have in past times made in their behalf; and they are here this night to testify that you have uniformly redeemed them all. (Great applause.)

“We think, on this occasion, of some who were your early companions; we look for them in vain; they walk no more with you. It would have been our pleasure to have given them also a tribute of respect. But you are still surrounded by a brilliant constellation of faithful spirits, who have never flinched from your side. I behold one who is here sharing with you the pleasures of return. I mean your own beloved Rogers: dear to us also, for his faithfulness in supporting the same principles. • • •

“We congratulate you and ourselves upon your safe return to your dear native country—to this city—to the soil which gave you birth—to the society of your beloved family, and to the dear friends that surround you;—to the coloured man whose cause you have advocated. And in expression of our fellowship and grateful sense of your devotedness to it, I now give you, in behalf of this meeting, my right hand, (great applause)—with it goes my heart! (overwhelming applause,) and the hearts of my brethren unitedly. Sir, (Amen, amen, from the meeting,) I present hearts before you that your enemies have not been able to change or conquer: hearts that could no more be bribed or stolen from you, than your heart can be from us. (Applause.) And now, Sir, in behalf of this assemblage, I invoke the blessing of high heaven upon your head! (Repeated and enthusiastic expressions.)”

C.—See page 9.

VOICE OF THE PRO-SLAVERY PRESS.

The *Christian Panoply*, a Journal notoriously hostile to the Anti-Slavery enterprise, makes use of the following language with respect to “New Organization,” and did space permit, sentiments of a similar character, from a great number of other papers might be introduced, but this, with a few other extracts, will be sufficient to lead the thinking to examine for themselves, and to discern its perfect harmony with the spirit of the New Organization Journals:—

“It has been alleged that those of us who would not fall into the Garrison ranks, were the friends and advocates of Slavery. Now, we are utterly opposed to Slavery; this, we know, is the general feeling at the North!! and our brethren who charge us with favouring Slavery, have borne wrong testimony against us. They do us and the cause an injury; they think to drive us into their ranks, or else to induce us to become the advocates of this moral evil. But we have done neither. We have protested against the outrageous course which Garrison has pursued, in breathing out rage and madness against the Slave-holders. And now, some of our brethren, who once followed him, have opened their eyes to his errors, and have seceded from his ranks. A division has taken place; a separation, with no prospects of a re-union.

“We very much doubt whether Mr Garrison is a real friend to the Coloured man!!

He has designs to accomplish; and in his aim at his main purpose, he presses in every thing that can be used for it. Now, non-resistance;—now, the woman question;—and now, tee-totalism. He hopes in this way to draw in many whom he could not otherwise reach.

Those who give, would do well to inquire what becomes of their money; is it applied so as to accomplish what the donors wish? Many church-members contribute to them, and their money is used to pay for the services of agents for railing against the church and its servants.

“They will find that in reality they are not struggling for the highest good of the black man, but against the ministry, who are the servants of the church; and thus in

reality warring against the church of Christ. Whether even some of the leading men in the Garrison ranks are aware of it, we doubt. Time has been, when we saw this state of things, but could not speak fully about it, because so many of the ministers were in those ranks; and their being there was an argument that no evil design was entertained. But they have seen their position; they have come out, refusing any longer to 'touch the unclean thing'—and now we can say, fearlessly, that Garrison is a bitter, uncompromising enemy of the church of Christ. Its institutions he hates; its Sabbaths he tramples down, and so eventually will his followers. Destroy the sacredness of the Sabbath, and you give the right hand of fellowship to infidelity.

To destroy the cause of Christ, you have only to overthrow the ministry, and make the Sabbath like other days, and your work is half done—yea, done. TRUE, WE HAVE NOT ENLISTED UNDER THE BANNER OF NEW ORGANIZATION; mainly, because we cannot relinquish our belief that COLONIZATION AT LIBERIA, is a benevolent enterprise; effecting more visible good than any other measure yet adopted. Its object and mode of government is vastly preferable to any English plan yet adopted."

The *Washington Globe*, a most malignant and ferocious journal against every thing in the form of genuine Anti-Slavery, after ridiculing the American Anti-Slavery Society, as being a "Woman's-Rights," "No-human-government Society," shows its sympathy with the seceding party, as follows:—

"These ultras had a majority in the late Anti-Slavery Convention at New York, and permitted women to vote, and be appointed on Committees." The consequence was, the secession of the minority, who did not relish this 'petticoat government,' and the formation of a new society, styling itself 'The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.'"

The *New York Herald*, of infamous notoriety, and especially distinguished for its pro-Slavery virulence, complimented the seceders as men who had a true sense of "self-respect," and added,—

"Garrison and his coadjutors, anxious only for notoriety, and reckless of the means of obtaining it, have stimulated the more inconsiderate of their followers to ultra and odious measures, in the hope of driving off all sober men of discretion, (!) and thus gaining undisputed control of the means and influence of the Society."

D.—See page 25.

As I am unable, at this time, to lay my hands upon the anecdotes designed for this Appendix, illustrating the foresight and integrity of Mr Garrison, I will supply their place with other useful information, though not so particularly relating to Mr Garrison.

At the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, on the 27th January, 1841, and the most numerous meeting of the Society ever held, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

"Whereas, from the fact that our beloved brother William Lloyd Garrison has been, under God, the mighty agent for arousing this country to a sense of her inexpressible blood-guiltiness; and whereas, from the power of truth with which he is clothed, he is now, as he has been from the commencement, more dreaded, by the Slaveocracy of the country than any other man, and consequently no devices have been spared to destroy, this influence, by the basest insinuations and most barefaced falsehoods, thereby making him the great stumbling-stone and rock of offence to the progress of the cause; and whereas, calls are heard from all parts of the State for visits from our brother, the conviction being felt that at his presence the foes would be subdued, and for these and other reasons, more could be accomplished for the cause by his public speaking, than by the united labours of many men; therefore,

"Resolved, That he be urgently invited to engage, as much as possible, in lecturing in the several towns in the Commonwealth, during the present season.

"Resolved, That while we have no conflict with the church or ministry, as such, but while we highly admire and commend such churches and ministers as remember those in bonds as bound with them, and preach deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to such as are bound; still we do most solemnly denounce the churches and ministers who refuse to bear an open and consistent testimony against Slavery, as against the separate crimes of which it is made up, as the most dangerous, because the most insidious, enemies of freedom; as the most strenuous opposers of the spread of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and the most earnest promoters of cruelty, vice, and irreligion in the land."

* Just as they did in 1839. Was this introducing any thing new?

The following extract, from the Ninth Annual Report of January, 1841, of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, one of the many State Auxiliaries of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will give some idea of its efficiency, notwithstanding the efforts of the Seceders to destroy it:—

“In consequence of the divisions which have taken place in this Commonwealth—the extraordinary and exhausting efforts which were made to redeem the pledge of ten thousand dollars to the National Society in 1839—and the suspicion and distrust which have been so widely excited against this Society—it has not been possible for the Board to carry on the operations of the Society during the past year, so efficiently or vigorously as they could have desired. But, though they have been unable to ‘make bricks without straw,’ they have endeavoured to make the best use of the means in their possession for the promotion of the Anti-Slavery enterprise. Since the last Annual Meeting, the receipts into the treasury have amounted to upwards of nine thousand dollars, and the expenditures to nearly the same amount. Of the expenditures, a considerable portion has been paid to the agents in the employment of the Society, for the past and preceding year. Among those agents have been Philo C. Pettibone, W. R. Chapman, Sumner Lincoln, Ezra C. Smith, Philemon R. Russell, J. S. Brown, James C. Jackson, N. H. Whiting, George Foster, Richard Hood, George Bradburn, T. P. Ryder, W. L. Garrison, John Jones, J. P. Bishop, C. M. Burleigh, J. D. Herrick, J. G. Duryee, S. S. Foster, Parker Pillsbury, Edwin Thompson, all of whom have laboured with zeal and fidelity during the period of their engagement.”

The following sentence is extracted from the Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, (1841), showing the relation the cause sustains to Mr Garrison’s peculiar views:—

“It is due to Mr Garrison to say, that no one has laboured more assiduously than himself to keep the Anti-Slavery enterprise distinct from every other, (question), and to avoid the introduction of ‘extraneous’ matters. Whatever may be his religious opinions, or his notions of the existing governments of the world, the Society has never been called upon to give them its approval.”

E.—See page 27.

The object of the Society shall be to endeavour, by all means sanctioned by law, humanity, and religion, to effect the Abolition of Slavery in the United States; to improve the character and condition of the free people of colour, to inform and correct public opinion in relation to their situation and rights, and to obtain for them equal civil and political rights and privileges with the whites.—*Constitution of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society*, Art. 2.

F.—See page 28.

Any person, by signing the Constitution, and paying to the Treasurer fifteen dollars as a life subscription, or one dollar annually, shall be considered a member of the Society, and entitled to a copy of all its official publications.—*Constitution of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society*, Art. 3.

Any Anti-Slavery Society, or any association founded on kindred principles, may become auxiliary to this Society, by contributing to its funds, and may communicate with us by letter, or delegation.—*Ibid*, Art. 11.

G.—See page 30.

Any person who consents to the principles of this Constitution, who contributes to the funds of this Society, and is not a Slave-holder, may be a member of this Society, AND SHALL BE ENTITLED TO VOTE AT ITS MEETINGS.—*Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society*, Art. 4.

II.—See page 31.

Any Anti-Slavery Society, or association, founded on the same principles, may become auxiliary to this Society. *The Officers* of each Auxiliary Society, shall be *ex-officio members* of the Parent Institution, and *shall be entitled to deliberate and vote* in the transaction of its concerns.—*Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society*, Art. 9.

I.—See page 39.

THE WORLD'S CONVENTION.

The refusal on the part of WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, and other delegates from the American Anti-Slavery Society, to participate in the proceedings of the *General Anti-Slavery Convention*, held in London, last June, has been much used to prejudice the minds of British Philanthropists against those gentlemen, and the Society which delegated them, as being committed to what is technically called the "*Woman's-Rights Question*."

To form a right judgment with respect to the proceedings of these gentlemen, in relation to the *rejection of the Women*, delegated by the largest body of Abolitionists in America; it is necessary that the circumstances connected with this subject should be well understood. When this is done, the whole matter will appear in quite a different light to that in which it has generally been viewed. Space will not permit a full presentation of the subject in this connexion. A few of the leading facts must suffice.

In the summer of 1839, the EMANCIPATOR, the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, threw out a suggestion, that a *World's Convention* ought to be held, to devise ways and means for the immediate extinction of Slavery and the Slave trade from the globe. In accordance with this suggestion, the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, issued a call for such a convention, requesting that delegates from the various parts of the civilized world, might be appointed to convene in London, in June 1840, for the objects specified above.

From the terms of the call it was understood, (1) that each Anti-Slavery Society was considered competent, by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to select their own representatives; (2) that persons properly delegated by regularly constituted Anti-Slavery Societies, would be received; (3) that the convention would not *entertain any subject foreign* to the Universal Abolition of Slavery and the Slave-trade.

In answer to this call, the American Anti-Slavery Society, desirous of having the various classes of Abolitionists represented in this convention, delegated Messrs Garrison and Rogers to represent one class; Mr Remond, a coloured gentleman, to represent the people of colour, and Mrs Mott to represent the women, agreeably to the usages of American Abolitionists. Other Societies in America did the same.

The convention was in Session several days previous to the arrival of Messrs Garrison, Rogers, Remond, and Adams, who found the anticipated World's Convention, fashioned into a conference with the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, (which in fact prescribed its rules and regulations,) and, that in consequence of previous correspondence with the Seceders in the United States, the *women delegates from America* were excluded, in addition to other narrow and proscriptive acts of the Committee. These gentlemen refused to enter the convention, not because the women *as such* had been rejected, but because regularly constituted delegates, some of whom bore credentials from the same society as themselves, had been refused admission, and because the convention had stepped out of its "*appropriate sphere*" to determine the INAPPROPRIATE DUTIES OF WOMEN. A refusal to join the convention, on the part of these men,

had delegates been refused admission on account of their religious or political creed, caste, height, or complexion, would have created no sensation whatever; on the contrary, such a testimony against such a glaring act of injustice, would have secured the admiration of millions. MR GARRISON and his coadjutors viewed in the same light, the rejection of those NOBLE WOMEN from America—who had left their home and friends, with hearts full of love and pity for enslaved millions, and crossed the broad Atlantic, with throbbing bosoms, to mingle their prayers and their sympathies with a WORLD'S PHILANTHROPY. Allowing that these men refused to enter because women, *as women*, were excluded, an objection to such a course comes with an ill grace from those who have seceded, or who justify such a secession from an Anti-Slavery Society, on the ground that women are not rejected.

K.—See page 39.

The following Resolutions were passed at the same Meeting of Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as that at which the transfer of the *Emancipator* took place, on the pretended ground of the insufficiency of funds, as will be seen by the Protest below:—

“*In the Executive Committee, April 16, 1840.*”

“Resolved, That as the sum of five hundred dollars has been contributed by the friends of James G. Birney, towards defraying his expenses to the London Convention, the sum of three hundred dollars additional be appropriated to enable him to fulfil his mission.

“Resolved, That so much as is necessary to pay the three hundred dollars to Mr Birney, be appropriated of the subscriptions made at the Cleveland Meeting, and the pledge of the Maine Society.

(Signed,) “JOSHUA LEAVITT, *Recording Secy.*”

“Resolved, That the sum of five hundred dollars be appropriated to defray the expenses of Mr Stanton to London, and that as much of the pledge of the Vermont Society, be specially pledged for that purpose.

(Signed,) “J. LEAVITT, *Recording Secy.*”

PROTEST.

“The Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society have voted to transfer the *Emancipator* to the New York City Society, on the alleged ground that they can no longer provide the means necessary to sustain it.

“*In the name of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, I protest against this act of the Committee, for the following (among other) reasons:—*

“1. The *Emancipator* is not the property of the Executive Committee. It belongs to the American Society, which is constituted of the Abolitionists of the country, who have sustained it through a long period of pecuniary embarrassment, and but for whose aid, it would have ceased to exist long ago. The aggregate excess of expenditure over all its receipts, since 1835, is more than *Ten Thousand Dollars*, which has been liquidated by the American Anti-Slavery Society, and not by the Executive Committee. The Committee, not being its real proprietors, have, therefore, *no right* to dispose of the *Emancipator*, by sale, transfer, or otherwise.

“2. The *Emancipator* is the official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The Executive Committee were appointed (in part) to conduct that organ, as the official exponent and vindicator of its principles,—as the guardian of its integrity,—as the proper and accredited medium of correspondence with its constituents and auxiliaries. To remove that organ, is, literally, to destroy a part of its organization—to strike at the existence of the American Anti-Slavery Society, whose members never contemplated vesting a suicidal power in their Executive Committee, which they might wield at pleasure.

“3. The transfer is not necessary, on the alleged ground. A statement of the property of the Society shows a large balance over all its liabilities.

“4. Due respect to the feelings and opinions of the Abolitionists generally dictates the propriety of referring the final disposition of the *Emancipator* to the approaching annual meeting. A suspension of the publication would be preferable to its transfer, as it would not thereby be placed beyond the power of the Society to resume it; whereas, by the vote now passed, it is irrecoverable.

“These are some of the more important considerations, which induce my dissent from the Committee.

“JAMES S. GIBBONS.”

L.—See page 40.

See extracts of the Rev. Mr Colver's letters, on page 45, 46, and the address of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, page 60.

The following is a copy of the correspondence of the Representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society, with the London Committee. By a reference to the dates of their respective letters, it will be seen that I was detained for nearly six weeks, for that which might have been accomplished in as many days, had a special meeting been convened as is customary under similar circumstances.

Before my correspondence was closed with the Committee, they sent letter (C.) over the kingdom, conveying in general terms the most severe charges, tending to destroy all confidence in the Society I had the honour to represent, and not unfrequently accompanied with Mr Colver's dastardly insinuations, tending to destroy Mr Garrison's influence, and my reputation, as the agent of the American Society. When the specific charges [*vide last section in letter D.*] are called for, the request is evaded by a declaration of the Committee that they "*have brought no charges*" [*see letter G.*]. No specific charges are preferred, for the very good reason that none can be sustained. But I will leave the reader to draw his own conclusions, after he has given the correspondence a thorough examination, as to whether there is any thing in this act of the Committee that is generous, open, and frank, and which will reflect credit upon the character of British Abolitionists.

(A.)

6, QUEEN STREET PLACE, SOUTHWARK BRIDGE, LONDON, Dec. 10th, 1840.

To the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

GENTLEMEN,—I am deputed by the American Anti-Slavery Society to solicit pecuniary aid in this country, to enable it to continue its exertions for the Abolition of Slavery in America.

It is with great reluctance that the Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society feel compelled to call upon their friends in Great Britain for pecuniary assistance, and they would have rejoiced to have been able to sustain their operations for the oppressed Slave, without being compelled so to do.

The recent monetary difficulties through which North America has been struggling for the last three years, have been so oppressive, and the sacrifices which the friends of the Negro have been called upon to make, have been so great, that they, however willing, are no longer able, without some aid, to sustain the Anti-Slavery cause.

The late contest, for the election of a President, has likewise been detrimental to the cause of Abolition, inasmuch as political opinions, by dividing men for a time, during a period of excitement, and attracting attention to another subject, begets for a while an estrangement between those who were heretofore united in the attainment of one grand object, and causes a diversion of funds to political objects, which had probably otherwise been devoted to emancipate those in bonds.

We trust, however, that if the Society can obtain the sum of £2000, it will enable it to retain its ground, until circumstances shall be so altered that the friends of Abolition in America may again be able to carry on the work of the Society without further assistance.

I therefore address myself to the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society for a grant of such a sum of money as it may be in their power to contribute, in aid of the American Anti-Slavery Society; but should the Committee be unable, from want of funds, to make any grant, then it only remains for me earnestly to solicit from them an expression of their cordial desire for the success of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

To you, as the acknowledged Society for the Abolition of Slavery, both in this country and all over the world, I enclose my credentials, signed by Charles Marriott, Secretary, and James S. Gibbons, Chairman of the Executive

Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, dated New York, Sept. 25th, 1840, and trust that the appeal thus made may meet with your cordial approval.*

A reply is respectfully solicited as early as the convenience of the Committee will permit.

With fraternal feelings, and a desire for your prosperity and faithful continuance in every good word and work, I subscribe myself,

Yours, very respectfully, for the cause,

J. A. COLLINS,

Representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

To J. H. TREDGOLD, Esq., *Secretary to the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.*

(B.)

British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, for the Abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade throughout the World.

27, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, 11th Dec., 1840.

DEAR SIR,—I have the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated yesterday, enclosing credentials from the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

We have no meeting in view of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society's Committee until the first of next month, when your letter shall be submitted.

The enclosed credentials I will send you back in a day or two.

I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

J. H. TREDGOLD.

(C.)

British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, for the Abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade throughout the World.

27, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, Jan. 2d, 1841.

To J. A. COLLINS, Esq.

SIR,—Your letter to the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was laid before them at their meeting yesterday, and was taken by them into full consideration.

It appears that the Committee are to regard you as an authorized Representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society, on whose behalf you are deputed to raise funds in Great Britain; and that you apply to them either for "a grant of a sum of money," or for "an expression of their cordial desire for the success" of the Society you represent.

With respect to the former part of the alternative, the Committee have to observe, that whatever the amount of their funds might be, they could not consider themselves entitled to dispose of them in the way you desire; so that they feel it their duty to decline altogether the consideration of a money grant; and easy as the adoption of the latter part of the alternative might appear, and painful as it is to find any ground for hesitation in this respect, the Committee are nevertheless constrained to say, that the course recently pursued by the American Anti-Slavery Society has alienated their confidence.

According to your request, the Committee forward this reply at the earliest moment. They have heard something, indirectly, of your wishing an interview with them; but they wait, before saying anything on this point, until they shall understand from yourself that this is your desire.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

J. H. TREDGOLD, *Secretary.*

(D.)

6, QUEEN STREET PLACE, SOUTHWARK BRIDGE, LONDON, Jan. 5th, 1841.

To the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

GENTLEMEN,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 2d inst., which reached me about three o'clock P.M., of yesterday, by which I was sorry

* In this correspondence, I did not allude to the division, as my credentials, which I submitted to the London Committee, exposed, very fully, the policy and course pursued by the "New-organization" party in America.

to learn from the Committee, "that whatever the amount of their funds may be, they could not consider themselves entitled to dispose of them in the way you desire."

Permit me to remark, Gentlemen, that the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society declared in their Annual Report of June, 1840, that "wherever there is a human being subject to Slavery, or the victim of the Slave Trade, thither should their eyes be turned, their sympathies directed, and their help afforded." This declaration I have understood as holding out the offer of co-operation and assistance to those who labour for the Abolition of Slavery in every part of the globe. I was, therefore, surprised when I read in your letter that you are not "entitled" to give the American Anti-Slavery Society, [if the state of your funds would permit,] that aid which its situation and circumstances require. I shall, therefore, be obliged to the Committee to explain their meaning, when they say, "that whatever the amount of their funds may be, they do not consider themselves *entitled* to dispose of them in the way you desire;" which desire was that you would assist the American Anti-Slavery Society, by a money grant, to carry on the work of Emancipation in the United States. If I am to understand this declaration of the Committee as a general one, applicable to all bodies associated for the Abolition of Slavery, then the words of your Report of 1840 have been misunderstood by me, and as the deputed Agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, I am to understand that the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society is not "entitled" (or at liberty), at any time, or to any Society, to render assistance in the form of a money grant.

The Committee inform me in their communication, that they "have heard something indirectly of your wishing an interview with them, but they wait before saying anything on this point until they shall understand from you that this is your desire." It must be, gentlemen, the earnest desire of every sincere and upright-minded man, or of every associated body of men, or of men and women labouring for the overthrow of Slavery, to gain the countenance and good wishes of all others working in the same cause of righteousness, whoever they may be, or wherever situated. You may, therefore, conclude that the American Anti-Slavery Society will be somewhat confused and anxious to ascertain what its "course recently pursued" has been to "alienate" your confidence" to that degree as to refuse to wish it God speed.

This "alienation" arises, no doubt, from a misunderstanding, on the part of the Committee, as to the real position of the American Anti-Slavery Society. It should be our endeavour, therefore, to remove every thing which separates brother from brother, and, for this end, I trust you will favour me with the charges implied in the "course recently pursued by the American Anti-Slavery Society," which has "alienated" your "confidence," that I may be prepared to appear before you, and to use my humble endeavours to remove from your minds those impressions erroneously entertained against the American Anti-Slavery Society, and injurious to the cause of the Negro.

Trusting that the Committee will let me hear from them with as little delay as possible,

I remain, Gentlemen, your obedient Servant, very respectfully,

J. A. COLLINS,

Representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

To J. H. TREGGOLD, Esq., &c.

(E.)

6, QUEEN STREET PLACE, SOUTHWARK BRIDGE, LONDON, Jan. 8th, 1841

To the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

SIR,—On Tuesday last, I transmitted to you a letter requesting to be made acquainted with all those circumstances which have "alienated" the American Anti-Slavery Society from the "confidence" of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and which, I learned, by a letter of the

second instant, bearing your signature as Secretary of that Society, are of so important a nature as to prevent the Committee from expressing their cordial concurrence with the American Anti-Slavery Society. As its accredited agent, I leave you to form an idea of the trying situation in which I am placed, at thus learning that any cause exists which should produce a separation between bodies, both of which, I am bound to believe, are diligently labouring to deliver their fellow-men from cruel bondage and oppression. To me, in these circumstances, it is additionally trying, because I am confident there is no just cause for this separation.

Painfully placed as I am, and feeling deeply the injustice done to the Society I represent, the injury to the cause of Emancipation, and also to myself individually,—a stranger in the country, appointed to act for that Society,—my way blocked up until I can obtain an opportunity of disabusing the minds of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society of the wrong impressions entertained by them against the American Anti-Slavery Society, and thus living here, comparatively idle, at considerable expense, you will, I am confident, see the propriety of making an early acknowledgment of the receipt of my letter. I beg the further assurance from you that a special Committee will be speedily called to reply to my letter, and relieve me from so painful a state of suspense.

I am, dear Sir, yours very respectfully,

J. A. COLLINS,

Representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

J. H. TREDGOLD, Esq., *Secretary to the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.*

(F.)

British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,

27, NEW BROAD STREET, 8th Jan., 1841.

To J. A. COLLINS, Esq., &c.

SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your communications of the 5th and 8th instant, and to acquaint you, in reply, that there will, in all probability, be a special meeting convened for Friday, the 15th instant, at four o'clock, of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to dispose of some matters of business which require their attention, when your letters shall be submitted for consideration.

I am, dear Sir, yours respectfully,

J. H. TREDGOLD, *Sec.*

(G.)

British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, for the Abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade throughout the World.

27, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, Jan. 16th, 1841.

To J. A. COLLINS, Esq., &c.

SIR,—Agreeably to your request, your letters of the 5th and 8th instant have been submitted to the consideration of a Meeting of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, held this evening, and I am instructed to inform you that the Committee have brought no "charges"! What has been "alienated" from the American Anti-Slavery Society is the "confidence" of the Committee in the salutary influence of that Society on the Anti-Slavery cause since the division which took place in May last:—that cause in the United States the Committee now consider as more truly represented by the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

J. H. TREDGOLD, *Sec.*

M.—See page 40.

SLANDERS AGAINST JOHN A. COLLINS.

“ When I see such games
Play'd by the creatures of a Pow'r who swears
That he will judge the earth, and call the fool
To a sharp reck'ning, that has lived in vain ;
And when I weigh this seeming wisdom well,
And prove it in th' infallible result
So hollow and so false,—I feel my heart
Dissolve in pity.”

COWPER.

NEITHER the American Anti-Slavery Society, nor its representative in this country, have anything to conceal. Their proceedings have been thus far, and it is to be hoped will be, in future, open, frank, and manly. It is by such means, that the enemies of “ Old organization ” are compelled to prosecute their work of destruction, under cover of darkness, by privately retailing falsehood and calumnies ; therefore, a place is given to the following official document from the Massachusetts Abolition Society, and extracts from that Society's official organ, the *Massachusetts Abolitionist*, and forwarded to the London Committee. These have been lithographed, and privately sent to the prominent and influential Abolitionists in Britain:—

“ OFFICE OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ABOLITION SOCIETY,
BOSTON, Feb. 1, 1841.

“ *To the Executive Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.*

“ GENTLEMEN,—At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, held at their Rooms, No. 32, Washington Street, this morning, the following preamble and resolutions were passed:—

“ Whereas, since the World's (!) Anti-Slavery Convention, held in June, 1840, in London, the leading journals of the Old organization Anti-Slavery Societies have busily attempted to traduce the characters of our transatlantic coadjutors, and particularly the London Committee, by affirming, that they had rather trust the Anti-Slavery cause in the hands of our pro-Slavery mobs than in the hands of the London Committee ; (1)* and whereas, other sentiments of a similar character have been published in the newspapers, professedly or virtually the organs of said Societies ; and whereas, the same bodies which have taken the above ground, and never, to our knowledge, retraced their steps, have delegated John A. Collins to England, to solicit funds to sustain said Old organization ; and whereas, we are informed that said Collins has made application for funds to the London Committee, and others, whose abolition character they have thus traduced ; therefore,

“ Resolved,—That, in the opinion of this Committee, John A. Collins, and a majority of those he represents, are not entitled to the confidence or support of our English friends.

“ Resolved,—That, in the opinion of this Committee, the money contributed to sustain the ‘ Old organization ’ in this country, will be wasted in the vain attempts to put down ‘ New organization ! ’ (2) they having taken the ground that ‘ New organization ’ is the worst form of Slavery, and their first business is to put it down.

“ Resolved,—That the representations made by the Rev. Nathaniel Colver to Joseph Sturge, Esq., in regard to John A. Collins are, in our opinion, entitled to your entire confidence!!

“ A true copy from the Records, attested,

“ JOSEPH W. ALDEN, *Rec. Sec.*”

* The figures 1, 2, 3, and 6, refer to notes commencing on page 64.

"J. H. TREDGOLD, Esq.

"DEAR SIR,—Enclosed you have the action of the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, in regard to John Collins' letters, John A. Collins, &c. &c. In regard to the Anti-Sabbath Convention, alluded to in the Rev. Mr Colver's letter, permit me to say that Rev. A. A. Phelps has written out his argument delivered at that Convention, and, as the Garrison party refuse to publish the doings of that body, he has added an Appendix, in which he quotes some of the infidelity of the Convention, (3).

"This will be published in a few days, and, when published, we will send you a copy, that you may judge for yourselves.

"Yours, for the Slave,

"J. W. ALDEN."

From the Massachusetts Abolitionist, January 7th, 1841.

"JOHN A. COLLINS.

"One piece of this man's knavery we will put on record, premising that it is of a piece with his whole history. His barefaced forgery of some pretended extracts of letters (4) in 'Mrs Chapman's Right and Wrong in Massachusetts,' is a small matter compared with other deeds. But to the facts. John A. Collins collected about 100 dollars in Hatfield, Massachusetts, nearly two years ago. It was collected by him on the express condition that it was to be paid over to the American Anti-Slavery Society(5)—not to the Massachusetts Society,—with the proceedings of which the donors of the money were dissatisfied (6). The money was never paid to the American Society. Subsequent to the formation of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, the donors of most of the money, learning Collins' unfaithfulness, gave directions that he should pay it over to the new Society's Treasurer. It was not done. The donors then authorized the representative of Hatfield in the General Court last winter to get the money of Collins, and pay it over to the Abolition Society. He tried very often—was put off with various excuses: 'will attend to it to-morrow'—(7) 'our board meets to-day, and then it shall be seen to'—and so on. But no satisfaction could be obtained. Subsequently, Mr Brackett, the Treasurer, received a written order, from the donors of the money, to pay it over to him. Promises of 'I will attend to it to-morrow,' (8) were all he could obtain. But the day or two before his departure to England, for his health and other causes, Collins acknowledged that the money ought to be paid, and should be, but went off without doing it, (9). The whole matter was subsequently laid before the Board of the old Society. Mr Garrison and this Board had never all this while heard a word of the matter. (!) They probably never heard of the money either. They believe it does not appear in their receipts; but, like honourable men, they have just paid it over to Mr Brackett, (10). So much for the facts. Now, will that Board do their duty, and cast off this agent who has so long owed his character for honesty to the forbearance of others—or must his loathsome history be brought more fully into view? We forbore formerly, for the sake of his wife now happily gone from a world where she suffered so much, (11). But now the day of reckoning has come. The good men, (12) who have been the objects of his abuse, ever since the day when he came as a spy, with falsehood on his lips, to our house in Salem, shall suffer from him no more. We wait to see if those honourable men, Jackson, Loring, Sewall, and Bassett, will publicly withdraw confidence from him, and recall whatever credentials he may have to our friends in England, where 'the state of his health' does not hinder him from deceiving 'the Peases,' and perhaps others, with his vile slanders. We cannot doubt that they will do so promptly, and save us the pain of a further exposure (!) of the shame of the Anti-Slavery cause from their countenance to such a man."

"COLLINS HEARD FROM BY AUTHORITY.—The object in crossing the Atlantic is partly on account of his health, and partly in connexion with the Anti-Slavery

cause; and we trust that his mission will not be in vain. In due time, the facts in relation to it will be laid before the public."—*Liberator*.

"EDITOR'S REMARK.—We did hope this devoted knave would have been suffered to remain without any attempt to bolster him up. But he shall soon be exposed, and that effectually. When such a man is needed as a tool, there's something rotten in the state of the Society that needs him."

"JOHN A. COLLINS.—A trivial error occurs in our notice of this man last week. The Hatfield money was collected by one Duryee, and paid over to Collins. We presume the old Society's Treasurer never received the money at all (!!)—we wait to learn."—*Massachusetts Abolitionist*, January 14th.

"JOHN A. COLLINS.—Mr Garrison says it is a sufficient reply to our brief exposure of this man's swindling! that the account was written by Charles T. Torrey, and talks about the 'almost fiendish' spirit we exhibit. All we have to say is, that the written evidence of every fact stated is in the possession of T. Brackett, Fulton Street, Boston, and may be seen by any one interested. And further, Mr Garrison knew this when he assaulted us. This attempt to sustain a bad man will recoil upon him. Our object in exposing him was to deprive him of the power of imposing on others, here or elsewhere."—*Massachusetts Abolitionist*, January 21st.

Such base and underhand measures as these, disgraceful even to the veriest politician, necessarily resorted to by the seceders to sustain their position, will reveal the design, spirit, and influence of the "New Organizationists" in America, more clearly than anything that can be said by me. They give a faint idea of their hopeless and unhappy position. Life will not loose its grasp without a struggle. 'These must be the dying throes of the party. Having failed, in their artful attempt, to get possession of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, they then sought to destroy the Societies which would not follow them, by exciting the religious prejudices of the people and by urging false objections against them; but having been foiled in this attempt also, they are now forced, as the last and only expedient, basely to assault individual character. To destroy my influence in this country as the representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society, advantage is taken of my absence from home to throw suspicion, in Great Britain, upon my character, by the fabrication of falsehoods adapted to answer a temporary purpose. The Rev. Charles T. Torrey and the Rev. Nathaniel Colver, both know that my religious principles will not allow me to bring them before a human tribunal, there to answer for their calumnies.

"The man that dares traduce, because he can
In safety to himself, is not a man."

Where I *am* known, a denial of these charges and insinuations is uncalled for, and it may be of little use for a stranger to testify in his own favour. I do solemnly affirm, however, that all the charges and implications contained in these extracts against my character, are untrue, and have not the least foundation in fact; but are designed, through me, to stab the Society I represent. How desperate must their cause be when such disgraceful measures are necessary to sustain it! Is it worthy to be considered a moral cause? Would honourable and high-minded men knowingly condescend to become parties to such scurrilous proceedings? Can they expect thus to divert the public mind from the gross acts of injustice towards the American Anti-Slavery Society in the transfer of the *Emancipator*, its organ, and other similar doings? What if all, implied in these extracts, be true, as regards myself? Does it prove anything against the Society I represent, more than that its Committee were grossly deceived in the selection of their Delegate? Does it prove that the American Society, or its present honourable Committee, have pilfered the Anti-Slavery public, and, with their ill gotten gain, are sustaining in this country an Agent to traduce and calumniate those they had plundered?

I would appeal to the good judgment and common sense of every enlightened Briton, if it can be supposed, for a moment, that those noble and pious men, who head the cause in America, would recommend a man whom they knew, or even suspected to be dishonest.

My credentials from the American Anti-Slavery Society, which, on account of their length, cannot be inserted here, close in the following language :—

“ We commend our friend and representative, John A. Collins, to your confidence and liberality. He has sacrificed and laboured much in the cause, and is unsurpassed for his zeal and devotedness to it. Whatever is done, must be done quickly. Invoking the benediction of heaven upon his mission,

“ We remain,

“ Yours, in the cause of bleeding humanity,

“ JAMES S. GIBBONS,

“ *Chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society.*

“ CHARLES MARRIOTT, *Secy.*

“ NEW YORK, *Sept. 25th, 1840.*”

The following Preamble and Resolutions are from the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society :—

“ BOSTON, *Sept. 30, 1840.*

“ At a Meeting of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, held this day, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted :—

“ Whereas, it having been deemed necessary by the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in the present exigency of our cause, to depute John A. Collins, (now a member of this Board, and General Agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society,) to visit England, in order to obtain such aid for the Parent Society, as the Friends of Negro Emancipation in that country may be disposed to contribute.

“ Resolved, That we cordially approve of the course they have thus thought proper to adopt, believing that it is warranted by the necessities of the Parent Society, and trusting that it will be liberally sustained by our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic.

“ Resolved, That we heartily concur in the appointment of our brother, John A. Collins, and commend him to the confidence and liberality of all who desire the extinction of Negro Slavery Universally, as one who has rendered essential service to the Anti-Slavery cause in this country.

“ Resolved, That for the overthrow of any great moral evil in the world, people of every clime and nation may lawfully combine ; and therefore, the friends of Universal Emancipation in England, may properly assist us by their contributions, their prayers, and their influence.

“ FRANCIS JACKSON, *President.*

“ WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *Cor. Secy.*”

After these slanders appeared in the *Massachusetts Abolitionist*, of January 7th, 1841, the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, having, through a Committee, investigated the grounds of the charges, passed the following Preamble and Resolutions, on the 25th of January, 1841 :—

“ At a meeting of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, held at the Society's Room, 25, Cornhill, on Monday, the 25th January, 1841, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted :—

“ Whereas, this Board has recently seen in the official organ of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, certain charges or insinuations intended to implicate the integrity of our respected brother, JOHN A. COLLINS ; and whereas this Board has, through two of its members, investigated and ascertained the groundless character of the charges or insinuations aforesaid ; and whereas, similar charges have been made against him in other quarters for the same purpose, and obviously meant to destroy his influence among our Anti-Slavery brethren in Great Britain, with whom he is now residing on an important and responsible mission from the American Anti-Slavery Society ; therefore,

“ Resolved, That this Board hereby expresses its full and unimpaired trust in the integrity and faithfulness of our brother, JOHN A. COLLINS, and recommend him to the respect and confidence of the friends of Emancipation universally.

"Ordered, That a copy of the foregoing resolutions be forwarded, by the Corresponding Secretary of the Society, to the Secretary of the London Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

"FRANCIS JACKSON, *Pres.*

"WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *Cor. Sec.*"

At the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, held in Boston, January 27th and 28th, 1841, the following Resolution was adopted :—

"Resolved, That this Society regards, with indignation, the insinuations and slanders respecting the character of its General Agent, John A. Collins, and upon its Corresponding Secretary, William Lloyd Garrison, contained in the following extracts of letters written by the Rev. N. Colver, and sent by him to Great Britain; and that those insinuations and slanders furnish another illustration of the spirit of New organization—a spirit alike unscrupulous and unprincipled."—(*See Colver's Extracts, pages 45, 46.*)

The following is extracted from the Annual Report of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, of 1841 :—

"Of the industry, perseverance, energy, and devotedness of Mr Collins, in the prosecution of his labours, the Board would speak in terms of commendation. In the afflicting bereavement which he has been called to suffer by the sudden death of his wife and child, they deeply sympathize. By his arduous efforts, he had so seriously impaired his own health as to be almost wholly disabled from sustaining the responsibilities of his agency; and it was therefore deemed advisable for him to make a transatlantic voyage, in order, if possible, to recruit his shattered constitution. Accordingly, with the unanimous advice and consent of the Board, and also supplied with letters of recommendation from them and the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society to the friends of Emancipation in Great Britain, Mr Collins sailed from New York for London, in the British Queen, on the 1st of October. News of his safe arrival has been received; but the Board regret to state, that his health does not appear to have been benefited by the voyage. In connexion with his absence in quest of physical restoration, he was deputed to act, as far as his strength would permit, in behalf of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and to obtain for it such pecuniary and other assistance as the Anti-Slavery public in Great Britain might be disposed to contribute. From the intelligence communicated in his letters, it appears that he is not likely to succeed, to any considerable extent, on the score of pecuniary aid, owing to various causes; but especially to the fact, that the virus of 'New organization' has poisoned the minds of the leading Abolitionists in that country, and led them to regard with distrust those Societies in the United States, which, as they suppose, have other objects in view, than the Abolition of Slavery. They have been grossly imposed upon by the same falsehoods and calumnies which have been circulated so industriously on our own shores against the Parent Society and its Auxiliaries; and, if they are animated by the generous and catholic spirit which should mark an enterprise like ours, it is only necessary for them to be furnished with all the facts in the case, to see and repudiate the error into which they have been led. AS HONEST AND IMPARTIAL MEN, THEY ARE BOUND TO HEAR ALL SIDES BEFORE THEY MAKE UP THEIR VERDICT. THIS DISPOSITION, THE BOARD REGRET TO STATE, THEY HAVE NOT, AS YET, BEEN DISPOSED TO MANIFEST."

It is certainly very astonishing that these alleged crimes, committed two years since, had not been made public previous to my departure for this country, as I was, during that time, daily exposing the subtlety, duplicity, and rottenness of "New organization."

But to the extracts :—

1. "*That they had rather trust the Anti-Slavery cause in the hands of our pro-Slaver, mob, than in the hands of the London Committee.*"

The sentence here quoted, is the declaration of but one individual. How many there are who are ready to endorse it, I am unable to say. No Society in America, however, has officially expressed a similar sentiment. There are but very few Abolitionists there, I am confident, who would be willing to make use of this language without some qualifications or explanations. Isolated, the sentence conveys, no doubt, a very different impression from that designed by the writer. His idea was, if I mistake not, that the London Committee had given the strongest evidence by their acts, that they could not, in the United States, stand erect

before the all-pervading influence of Slavery, nor in this country, stand by those American Abolitionists who were boldly and unflinchingly combatting the monster upon its own soil, and hence, in America, more to be dreaded than a pro-Slavery mob. Anti-Slavery in Great Britain, is a national virtue. So long as it is kept in this country it will remain true. It requires no sacrifice of reputation to denounce Slavery, or to advocate the principles of Negro Emancipation, which are fellow-shipped by the lower classes, advocated by the higher circles, and clad in the robes of royalty. In America, it is quite different. Slavery is a national sin. All classes of society have a supposed interest in its continuance. The advocates for Emancipation are subjected to insult, proscription, mob-law, and murder. So powerful is the pro-Slavery spirit in America, that every Abolitionist from this country, with but four or five exceptions, has been unable to stand before it. They have not only shunned the Abolitionists with the instinctive dread of a Slave-holder, but what is actually worse, counselled with their enemies. All their opposition to Slavery, if they expressed any, was rendered powerless by their opposing or dodging the Emancipationists. Such Anti-Slavery, when the Slave-holders understand it, will be above par with them. It will not disturb their inglorious quiet. It can never abolish American Slavery. The power of the Anti-Slavery cause in the United States, lies in its principles. Give way one iota to propitiate the spirit of Slavery, and the cause is gone. The Seceders in America have quailed before this spirit, and at its fiat, have commenced a war of extermination against effective Anti-Slavery—modified their tone of denunciation against the apologists for this wicked system, and in order further to propitiate this spirit, they have endeavoured to cast out the women, who have been the life-blood of the cause, and are now using all their energies to silence the noble Garrison. The next demand which Slavery will make, will be that Slavery shall not always be considered sinful. For peace, this last point must be yielded. The London Committee have entered into copartnership with the Seceding party, and are humbly striving to imitate its example. Again,—at the instance of this same party, the Committee endeavoured to influence the General Convention in London, to disgrace the American, the largest Anti-Slavery Society in the world, before the American Slave-holders, to refuse a portion of its delegates admission, to choke down free discussion, and to cap the climax of injustice, to imitate the American pro-Slavery Congress, by throwing a respectful protest upon the table, as that body does the petitions of Abolitionists. In the United States, these acts of this Committee, among opponents and timid friends, pass for genuine Anti-Slavery. To the Slave-holder, any thing is reasonable Abolition, which will divert the friends of the Negro from the main question, or cast reproach upon the Anti-Slavery character of William Lloyd Garrison and his coadjutors. Anti-Slavery sickens in consequence of these compromising and backslidings. In the language of Miss Martineau, “Those who are not with the thorough-going are necessarily against them.” There is no trouble in identifying a pro-Slavery mob, with Slavery itself. It makes no pretention to an Anti-Slavery character. By its influence the sympathies of the just are excited, and by its means thousands have enrolled themselves under the banner of freedom. Hence the cause of the American Slave, in the estimation of the writer of the sentence which heads these notes, would be more safe in the hands of a pro-Slavery mob, than in the hands of the “New organized” London Committee.

“’Tis true, an open foe may prove a curse,
But a cowardly friend is ten times worse.”

If I may be allowed, from my own experience, to speak of the London Committee, I would say, that the open attacks of a pro-Slavery mob, are far preferable to the under-hand secret manœuverings of this Committee, to defeat the object of my mission through the destruction of my character.

It is grossly libellous to assert, that the friends of “old organization” have traduced the Abolitionists of this country. If all the eulogies and praiseworthy sayings, with respect to them, which have been printed in the “old organization” journals were collected and published, they would make quite a respectable library. While some have spoken freely upon the all-pervading Anti-Slavery feeling of the country, and the good that has been and will be accomplished for the Negro, they have also taken the liberty to speak of the nature, influence, and defects of British Abolition.

But what has this to do with the merits of the Seceders? Why this attempt to get a new objection? Their only official reason assigned for separating, was because the American Society had committed itself to the "Woman's Rights," and "Non-resistance" questions. On account of this committal, they were "compelled for the sake of peace and the poor Slave," to new organize. Unable to maintain their position as to the cause of the secession, they are now "compelled for the sake of peace and the poor Slave," to follow the American Society to this country, and with the same spirit of extermination which characterizes them at home, now appeal to personal feelings to excite jealousy and opposition.

2. "*Will be wasted in the vain attempt to put down 'new organization.'*"

This is certainly a very novel reason why "Old organization" should not be sustained. If Colonization, or even Slavery itself, had thought that they could have dissuaded British Abolitionists from aiding the American Anti-Slavery Society, they would, no doubt, have followed me to this country with a similar remonstrance. Time was when Colonization urged the very same reasons in Britain, why money should not be contributed to sustain the Anti-Slavery cause in America. But this handmaid to Slavery, unable longer to deceive British Abolitionists, is summoned home, and Slavery commissions a new body to perform its work, and the better to effect its unholy and secret purpose, attires it in the robes of freedom.

"To destroy new organization."—Here is the rub. This organization is an attack upon the Anti-Slavery enterprise, and its leaders know it. Abolitionists have never been able to make a direct assault upon the conscience of the Slaveholder, in consequence of the war which northern pro-Slavery, under various modifications, from "mob-law," "American Union," "Clerical appeal," up to "New organization," (*keeping pace with the advanced state of public opinion,*) have made against the American Anti-Slavery Society. Every succeeding association, from the commencement of the Anti-Slavery warfare, has assumed more of an abolition character than its predecessor, and hence more subtle and dangerous. The "New" is a direct war of extermination upon "Old organization," which acts only upon the defensive. Its "attempt to put down New organization," will consist in proving the charges officially assigned by them for their secession, to be entirely false.

"Having taken the ground that 'New organization' is the worst form of Slavery."—This association is in the attitude of the man who cries, "stop thief," that he may make off with the stolen goods under the cover of that cry. It is "New organization which is waging a war of extermination against the 'Old Society.'" Read a very few of its official declarations. It asserts that Old organization has been "perverted to purposes and objects, not contemplated in our bond of union,—foreign to our original objects, not necessary to their attainment, and in view of the reflecting, FATAL to our prospects of ultimate success;" that in refusing to eject a portion of its most effective members, it has been guilty of "a violation of good faith;" that it has attached to the cause "*a mill-stone to sink to the depths of a bottomless ocean, the hopes of enslaved millions;*" that "it has made a DISTINCT and DELIBERATE SACRIFICE OF PRINCIPLES;" and that it is "fully identified with the sectarian views of a few of its individual members," &c., &c. The official organ of the "New organization," declares, "that it (the Old Society,) has endorsed the doctrines of Non-resistance, and poured contempt upon the old constitutional measures of Abolitionism;" that "*the Old Society stands in a position fatal to accomplishment,*" and is "governed by the element of non-resistance," to the "entire prostration of its strength," &c., &c. Now, if these allegations, against "Old organization" are true, "New organization" is solemnly bound to put forth every effort for its immediate annihilation. If this is not accomplished, it will not be because the Seceders have been scrupulous in the use of means, the most base and disgraceful. But the very moment "Old organization" sets up a defence against their tissue of absurdities, misrepresentations, and calumnies, obviously invented for bad purposes, to gratify sectarian pride, and to propitiate the pro-Slavery party, a cry is raised at once, it is an "attempt to put down 'New organization.'"

The American Anti-Slavery Society has been sustained at an annual expense

of from 40 to 50,000 dollars. To raise this sum, in addition to the heavy expenditures of the different state and local auxiliaries, Abolitionists have been called upon to make great sacrifices. "New organization" must show to the Abolitionists some valid reasons why the country should be saddled with the expense of a double set of machinery. In proportion as they can make it appear that the *Old Society* "has made a distinct and deliberate sacrifice of principles," they will secure their confidence. Thus the seceders traverse the length and breadth of the free States, exciting the prejudices of the people, ignorant of the real facts of the case, and by this, endeavour to alienate the auxiliaries of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and they can succeed only in so far as they are able to make this appear. Thus arrayed in the attitude of hostility, one or the other of these Societies must be in the wrong;—one is genuine, the other spurious;—one is loyal, the other schismatical. If they were united in spirit, they would not be divided in action.

3. "In which he quotes some of the infidelity of the Convention."

So it appears the London Committee has constituted itself a heresy-hunting branch of the American Seceders.

4. "His barefaced forgery of some pretended extracts of letters."

Mr Torrey, when he penned this, implicating me in forgery, knew that he could not sustain the charge with the least shadow of proof. He was fully and publicly convicted as the author of the letter referred to, by the strongest evidence, nearly two years since. It is quite remarkable, that all of a sudden he should select me out as the object of his abuse. The history of this letter will be briefly related:—

In December, 1838, Rev. P. C. Pettibone, then a fellow-student with myself, in the Theological Seminary at Andover, received a confidential letter from this Rev. Mr Torrey, revealing a deep-laid plot, (a part of which will be found in the certificate given below,) by which the *Liberator* was to be destroyed, Garrison's influence weakened, and the cause transferred into the hands of the clergy. Mr Pettibone exhibited the letter to the Rev. E. C. Smith, his room-mate, Rev. W. R. Chapman, his class-mate, myself, and to other six or seven of his particular friends. Mr Smith, at this time, deeply sympathised with Mr Torrey. Mr Pettibone had previously acted as an Anti-Slavery agent under Mr Torrey, who felt that he had secured his confidence. I lost no time in exposing this manoeuvre to Mr Garrison and others, who placed Mr Torrey and his fellow-conspirators in no very enviable position, before the Anti-Slavery public.

In the spring of 1839, Mrs Chapman embodied a part of the letter in a history of this conspiracy, which greatly enlightened the Abolitionists, with respect to the spirit and object of the new organizers. Mr Torrey, knowing that Mr Pettibone had lost the letter, endeavoured to exonerate himself from the disgrace of writing it, and to throw discredit upon this valuable work, by denying its authorship, and on the 12th of Nov., 1839, wrote to her for the letter, to which she replied, through the *Liberator*, as follows:—

"BOSTON, Nov. 22d, 1839.

"REV. CHARLES T. TORREY,

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of Nov. 12th, this day received, requesting information respecting the letter alluded to in 'Right and Wrong in Massachusetts,' pp. 59 and 67, I enclose a copy of a certificate as to its contents, signed by the gentleman to whom you addressed it, and by two gentlemen to whom, among others, he communicated it; which, before I wrote that book, I deemed it proper to have. In giving me to understand that you have publicly denied writing such a letter, you furnish me with the proper ground on which to publish this certificate.—I am, yours faithfully,

"MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN."

CERTIFICATE.

The following is the substance of Mr Torrey's letter:—

"Charles T. Torrey wrote to P. C. Pettibone last December, stating that Garrison had a great deal of influence in this State, and hence it would not be safe to attack him or the *Liberator* openly. We needed a new paper: he had sounded the ministry throughout the State, and they were for it to a man. Now,

brother Pettibone, have on a full delegation at the annual meeting, to come at 10 o'clock, prepared to stay two days; have them pledged to go for the new paper and spar the annual report, and we will show them how it is done..

(Signed,) "P. C. PETTIBONE,
"EZRA C. SMITH,
"J. A. COLLINS."

"The following note from Mr Pettibone, will explain the reason why Mr Torrey's letter to him has not been published :—

"MRS CHAPMAN,

"The letter which I received from Charles T. Torrey, some time in the month of December last, to which reference is made in the Certificate, signed by myself, Smith, and Collins, has by some means been lost. I think the letter was in my possession, and that of some of my friends for about two weeks after its reception. I have searched my room repeatedly to find the communication, and have made diligent inquiry of those who saw and read it, and have not been able to lay my hands upon it. I have come to the conclusion, that the letter must have been accidentally lost by *some one who read it*, or that by some means, it got among my papers, and was swept into the fire.—Very respectfully yours,

"P. C. PETTIBONE."

Mr Smith, in a letter to Mrs Chapman, of December 3d, 1839, says,—

"I saw and read the letter which Mr Torrey wrote to P. C. Pettibone in December last, the substance of which is contained in the certificate. I would add, furthermore, that Mr Torrey came to my room in the month of August preceding, and then stated that a new Anti-Slavery paper was contemplated. Speaking of the *Liberator*, he said, 'That paper is too bad.'"

I would add, that Mrs Chapman has now in her possession the written testimony of six or seven unimpeachable witnesses, stating that they saw this letter from Mr Torrey. With all my heart, I pity the man who can thus maliciously, without the semblance of a cause, attempt to murder the reputation of another.

5. "*It (the money,) was collected by him on the express condition to be sent to the American Society.*"

This characteristic charge is as false as the heart of the man who indited it. I never was in Hatfield. The money referred to was collected by Mr J. G. Duryee. All I had to do with it, directly or indirectly, was simply to unseal the letter from Mr Duryee containing it, and to pass it over to H. G. Chapman, Esq., Treasurer of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Whoever will take the trouble to look into the *Liberator* of October 25th, 1839, will find Mr Duryee's collection in the Treasurer's acknowledgment of monies received,—which paper is in the possession of Joseph Pease, Sen., Darlington.

6. "*With the proceedings of which the donors of the money were dissatisfied.*"

Will Mr Torrey please to inform his readers how they became dissatisfied? Was it not occasioned by the false statements of himself and coadjutors industriously circulated against the Old Society with a view to its destruction, and upon its ruins to build up their "New Organization?" But

"*Incidis Scyllam cupiens vitare Charibdim.*"

7. "*Was put off with various excuses :—'I will attend to it to-morrow.'*"

In the summer of 1839, subsequent to the formation of the "Massachusetts Abolition Society," J. G. Duryee was commissioned, by the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, an agent to solicit funds, to enable the Board to liquidate a debt just occasioned by the payment of a pledge of 10,000 dollars made the year previous to the American Anti-Slavery Society. Mr Duryee collected 167 dollars, 91 cents; 86 dollars of which, he informed me by letter, was to redeem the pledge to the American Anti-Slavery Society. As the Board was under no pledge to that Society, and as he was expressly commissioned to solicit funds to enable the Society to pay its debts, the Treasurer and myself took it for granted that Mr Duryee had made it appear to the donors that the debt was occasioned by the redemption of this pledge; and therefore, they wished their money to be considered as their part of the pledge. In process of time, however, I learned from Mr Duryee that he had collected the

amount for the redemption of a pledge of 5000 dollars, which he was erroneously impressed had been made to the National Society.

The gentleman from Hatfield, referred to by Mr Torrey, called upon me, and requested that the money should either be paid to the American Society, or refunded to the donors. His calls were frequent. He was informed, that the subject should be submitted to the Board at its first meeting for their decision, as to whether the money should be paid over to the American Society or refunded. At the day of the meeting, a quorum was not present, but the members to whom I made known the facts, were of opinion that the eighty-six dollars should be returned to the donors. Business called me from the city, and before my return the good man had gone home, and consequently the affair remained unsettled.

8. *"I will attend to it to-morrow, was all he could obtain."*

This is untrue. I distinctly informed Mr Brackett, that as soon as the Society had the ability, the money should be paid. I also informed him, that I was not personally responsible for its payment.

At this time, Mr King, one of the Committee of the "New organization," had been for some time in arrears to the "Old Society" for nearly one hundred dollars. As Mr Brackett owed this gentleman, it was my design to have Mr King pay the amount to him. This arrangement, Messrs. King and Brackett intimated to Mr Bishop, the Clerk in the office of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, that they should be willing to make.

9. *"But went off without doing it."*

This is false. The day previous to my sailing, I called upon Messrs. King and Brackett, and each consented to make the arrangement, by which Mr Brackett was to look to Mr King to whom he was in debt for the amount the "Old Society" was in arrears to him. As my haste did not permit me to go through the formality of passing receipts, the Seceders taking advantage of this circumstance, have endeavoured to convert the affair into "New organization" capital.

10. *"But like honourable men, they have just paid it over to Mr Brackett."*

How "Mr Brackett," "like" an "honourable" man, could have received the money from these men, after the arrangements made with me, I will leave the reader to judge for himself.

11. *"Now happily gone from a world where she suffered so much."*

This cruel and assassinating thrust is craftily indefinite. It may mean one thing, or it may be forced to mean another. The idea which this calumniator designed to convey, must however, be obvious. From this it appears, that one of the objects embodied in the principles of "New organization" benevolence, is to exercise a parental supervision over the domestic affairs of Abolitionists. The Societies I have the honour to represent, have been negligent in prosecuting this department of Anti-Slavery labour.

So wide, however, is this matter from the question of Slavery, that the reader cannot reasonably expect from me a chapter on household affairs, whenever any malignant, envious, jealous, or ill-disposed person, may be inclined to drag me before the Anti-Slavery public. I will, therefore, dismiss this most painful part of the subject, by assuring him that this malicious insinuation is perfectly in keeping with the whole production.

12. *"The good men who have been the objects of his abuse," &c.*

The "good men" referred to, are—the Rev. Charles T. Torrey and his fellow conspirators against the peace and efficiency of the Anti-Slavery enterprise.

What this reviler means when he speaks of "a spy," and "our house in Salem," I certainly am unable to imagine. I never was, to my recollection, in his house but once, and that was subsequent to the revelation of the conspiracy, of which this gentleman was one of the leaders, and its consequent defeat. Knowing as Mr Torrey did, and every one else who knew me, what were my views as to their abusive proceedings, I will leave it to the reader to judge for himself, how much of a spy I could have been. The spirit which dictated these extracts is the spirit of "New Organization." There are good men connected with it, but they do not know its object and influence. If they did, they would, I am confident, renounce all connexion with it at once. So close is its imitation to genuine abolition, that it almost "deceives the very elect."

CAPTAIN CHARLES STUART'S PRIVATE CIRCULAR.

"In December, 1833, an Anti-Slavery Society was formed in the United States of North America. The demand for it was extreme; for the Slave system of the United States was the most desperately corrupt and ferocious which existed. The principles and objects of the Anti-Slavery Society thus formed were eminently excellent; and the means which it adopted for the attainment of its glorious object were perfectly in keeping, for the *first four years*, with its noble principles.

"But, in the course of 1837, *new* opinions began to be broached: and one of these gradually assumed the position, that 'whatever is morally right for a *man* to do, is morally right for a *woman* to do;' (1) and, therefore, women ought to be intruded, as delegates, debaters, and managers, into mixed Societies of men and women.

"This insane innovation, at first, had so dubious a form, that its real character scarcely appeared; but, as soon as this became evident, it was vigorously resisted. Resistance, however, only aggravated the zeal of its advocates; and the *new truth*, as they call it, quickly assumed such importance in their eyes, and was so offensively intruded by them into all the proceedings of the Society, that *they* who conscientiously (2) resisted it had no alternative but to submit to it or to separate themselves. I was one of the many who preferred the latter alternative without hesitation. The separation took place early in 1840; that of the leading Society in New York, in May, 1840. At the division on the question, the Innovators were found the most numerous; and, of course, the original name of 'The *American* Anti-Slavery Society' remained with them. But they who rejected the innovation, having fewer votes present, took a new name,—'The *American and Foreign* Anti-Slavery Society.'

"The Abolitionists in the United States now consist of these two parties, together with a third, (3) separate from both—which, like the other two, pleads for immediate and thorough Emancipation, but which, from various motives, refuses to *associate* for that purpose.

"Under these circumstances, the *American*—or *woman-intruding*—Anti-Slavery Society sends Agents to this country, Messrs COLLINS and REMOND, to beg our money. But let us remember that, whatever countenance we give to these gentlemen, in this agency, will go more directly to strengthen a pernicious party in the United States than to aid the general cause of Abolition (!) The errors of the advocates of justice are often more ruinous to righteousness than all the hostility of open enemies. By such aid Britain would be identified, as far as it goes, with the rhapsodists of the United States; and the sacred and powerful influence exercised so nobly and so beneficially by the late London Convention, in decidedly and at once rejecting the woman-intruding delusion, would be paralysed or lost,—liberty would be wounded anew by the blunders of her friends,—while they who love her more sanely, and who plead her cause unentangled with the snare, would be enfeebled by the encouragement given to the dogmatism and delusions of their adversaries.

"They who value the intrusion of women into the debates and management of mixed Societies more highly than the cause of liberty and love, will, of course, give their quotas to Mr COLLINS. With such I remonstrate not. But I am anxious that others should not be deceived: in giving him their money, they will rather impede than aid the general progress of Abolition; because they will contribute to hold up the Abolition effort as at war with the most sacred and fundamental of human relations—even with those relations, by which God has given to men and women their respective spheres, and by sacredly regarding which alone, the vast moral power of women, with all its purifying influences, can be preserved to society.

"I would say, with all respectfulness and affection, if we have anything to spare for the furtherance of freedom in the United States—and it is a cause *worthy of all support*—let us give it to those amongst the Abolitionists in the United States who harmonize with us, who pursue the same holy object on the same peaceful principles, and by the same sane means as we do, and who, since our General Convention in London, have given us the invaluable services of such men as BIRNEY and STANTON: and not to those who, after making the most injurious discord in their own country, did their best to distract our Meeting: in

June; who have since been unsparing in grossly slandering us; and who now send an Agent to ask our money for the American Anti-Slavery Society,—as if the American Anti-Slavery Society represented the great body of the Abolitionists of the United States, instead of a MINOR AND EVIL PART OF THEM, which is full of DOGMATISM and CONTENTION, (4.)

“Any money remitted to Mr LEWIS TAPPAN, Pearl Street, New York, for Abolition purposes, will be sure of direct and powerful application to the sacred cause of holy liberty and love, without partiality and without hypocrisy.

“C. STUART.”

This defamatory printed circular, from Captain Charles Stuart, has been *privately* placed in the hands of those whose minds would be, very naturally, disaffected with a body pursuing the course falsely attributed by this production, to the American Society. It is inserted here, that the reader may perceive the spirit of the seceders and their abettors, not only in the United States, but also in this country. All their energies are put forth, not to awaken a fresh zeal for the suffering cause of the oppressed bondman, but to cut off all the resources of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and hence to destroy it. Nothing will satisfy them, but its entire annihilation. Here no attempt is made to sustain his proposition, that the American Anti-Slavery Society, is a “woman-intruding Society” by proof; but naked assertion, characteristic of the seceders, is given in the place of facts and arguments. If all that is here urged against the Society be true, with regard to the action of women, Captain Stuart is certainly the last individual who would have been expected, by those formerly acquainted with him, to have objected to it on this ground. It is the Captain, not the American Society, which has introduced into the Anti-Slavery cause “new views.” He has left his former position, and now wars against every one who does not come round to him. This gentleman was in the United States in 1837, when the Misses Grimke were lecturing, and no one at that time was more enthusiastic with regard to their labours, than himself. Many anecdotes, in relation to various efforts on his part, to bring women forward in the Anti-Slavery cause, not only in America, but in this country, might be given, but space will only permit the insertion of the following:—

“In October, 1837, Captain CHARLES STUART met the Anti-Slavery Committee in Darlington. His object was to secure a delegation from that place, to attend an Anti-Slavery Congress which was to be held in London, on the 14th of November of the same year, for the purpose of concerting measures for the repeal of the Apprenticeship system. Captain Stuart again and again begged the Committee to send up a *female* delegate. ‘If there be a lady,’ he continued, ‘who has the *head* and *heart* to represent you, I am sure she will be joyfully received, and they will *thank* heaven for sending her.’”—*Miss Pease’s Reminiscences.*

We shall append a few brief notes. And

1. “*One of these gradually assumed the position that whatever is morally right for a man to do, is morally right for a woman to do.*”

Captain Stuart, in introducing this borrowed sentence, has conveyed to the reader the false impression that the American Anti-Slavery Society, in its zeal to promote its “new views” had declared, that “whatever is morally right for a man to do, is morally right for a woman to do.” His motives, for doing this, are best known to himself. He well knew, that these were the words of a female who advocated the religious and political equality of the sexes. He also must have been aware that no anti-slavery society in America has ever endorsed any sentiment of the kind, and that the Seceders are the only individuals who have ever called upon anti-slavery societies, to entertain for a moment, “Woman’s Rights,” or any other “extraneous question.” He might, with equal justice or propriety, have made a quotation from the writings of Lady Morgan, and then, from it, have drawn the conclusion that the American Society was a “Woman-intruding Anti-Slavery Society.”

2. “*They who conscientiously resisted it had no alternative but submit or separate.*”

Will the captain be kind enough to inform us, in his next “printed circular,” where his “conscience,” and the “conscience” of his coadjutors was in 1837? He might in truth say with the poet:—

“Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.”

3. "*The Abolitionists now consist of these two parties, together with a third, who plead for Immediate Emancipation.*"

That there are now, and ever have been, those who would have identified themselves with the Emancipationists, were it not for the odium attached to their cause, or in consequence of their ignorance of the nature and influence of the enterprise, there can be no doubt. If the Americans had not a supposed interest in slavery, they would all be Abolitionists, as no one loves oppression or slavery for its own sake.—That such however, constitute a "party," which "pleads for thorough and Immediate Emancipation," is a fact which American Abolitionists are yet to learn from Capt. Stuart. Pro-Slavery, under all its modified forms, has always clamorously maintained that it was the only true and consistent friend of the slave, but that this should be acknowledged by a professedly uncompromising abolitionist, without having in view some ulterior object, is truly astonishing. It has been the aim of the Seceders in America to secure the co-operation of the friends of "Old organization," to aid them in the prosecution of their undermining policy, without exciting opposition; but when they fail to accomplish this, so intent have they been upon the annihilation of the American Society, that they have had recourse to the most undignified measures to induce them to stand aloof from both Societies altogether. If the Seceders succeed, by their calumnies against "Old organization" in alienating the confidence of Anti-Slavery friends, to that extent as to secure their co-operation, or to stand aloof from both Societies.—In either case their opposition to the American Society on the one hand, or their indifference to the Anti-Slavery question on the other, is so great, that they may, with few exceptions, be ranked among the practical enemies of the Slave.

4. "*Instead of a minor and evil part of them, which is full of dogmatism and contention.*"

It would be very natural to suppose, that the Captain, who so unsparingly lavishes upon the Old Society and its friends, the epithets of "*Insane*"—"Innovators"—"*Women-intruding*"—"Pernicious"—"*Rhapsodists*"—"Delusions"—"*Dogmatisms*"—"Adversaries"—"*Evil party*," &c., would be willing to sustain such charges when called upon to do so, but such is not the fact. On the 3d of March, 1841, the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, invited him "to meet them, for the purpose of defending the charges made by him against the American Anti-Slavery Society, in his *printed letter*, which has been widely circulated through the country; that defence, to be made in the presence of John A. Collins, and in the first instance before the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society."

The following extracts are from Mr Stuart's reply to the Committee, refusing to comply with its invitation:—

"I am not aware that those charges need any defence. They are simple matters of fact, and rest on other grounds than on my affirmations, and I am not of opinion that truth becomes more true by mere repetition. But I do here, most unequivocally, solemnly, and fully re-affirm their entire truthfulness (!!)

"In Edinburgh, I offered Mr Collins to debate this question with him round the kingdom, he then declined it, (1). I have since been satisfied, that I, at that time, greatly overrated his powers of *mischief in the Abolition cause*, amongst us, (!!) so that I do not feel at all warranted, at present, in duty, to turn any portion of my time and means, from the direct service of God and my fellowmen, to the indulgence of irrelevant, captious, and pernicious questions.

"I trust and believe that my Circular has produced, in a good measure, the healing and purifying effect for which it was solemnly and kindly intended; and it will be time enough for me to undertake its defence, when I find that my countrymen are far more astray from God and their brother, and are far more given up to the pernicious intrusion of extraneous and distracting questions, than I believe them to be."

To this letter, a remark or two must be appended; and

1. "*In Edinburgh, I offered Mr Collins to debate this question with him round the kingdom.*"

In November, 1840, I met the Anti-Slavery Committee in Edinburgh, at which Capt. Stuart was present. On being censured by some one for introducing the American divisions into this country, he remarked that he felt conscientiously bound to introduce them, the first thing, wherever he went. Declared that he was not afraid to discuss the subject—with Mr Remond, myself, George Thompson, or even an angel. The Committee adjourned to have the matter discussed between Captain Stuart and myself. After this interview with the Committee, the Captain writes me, requesting "I shall be glad, if agreeable to you, to spend part of to-morrow with you, for the purpose of exploring your documentary evidence. My wish is, to take extracts from them, accompanied by your own views, in your own words, that I may transmit them for reply to my friends in the United States,—and I wish this, that if your views can be disproved, by any evidence with which I am not yet acquainted, I may be master of the disproof."

From my reply to him, dated Edinburgh, November 4th, I extract the following sentence:—

"If yourself, or any of your American friends (referring to Birney and Stanton, the latter of whom I subsequently challenged to defend the charges made against Old organization, but he declined) should feel constrained to challenge a public discus-

sion, with respect to the charges preferred against the American and Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Societies, I should not feel at liberty to decline, when my 'documentary evidence,' as a matter of course, with my 'own views' in my 'own language,' will be at your service, and that of the public at large."

The day following I breakfasted with Captain Stuart, and challenged him to hold a public discussion. He replied in the presence of the lady of the house, that he could not, inasmuch as he knew nothing of the Anti-Slavery movements, with respect to the division, since 1837!!

It may reasonably be inferred, from the following extract from Captain Stuart's letter to the Glasgow Committee, of March 3d, that his refusal to meet them grew out of the fact, that he was conscious of his inability to sustain the position assumed in his printed circular:—

"I expect shortly, to make a trip of a few months to America, on my private affairs. As far as duty permits, I shall then further explore this question, as it continues to develop itself,—and upon my return, shall probably make a pretty extensive Anti-Slavery tour, for the communication of my information," &c.

When he gets possession of the information he desires to obtain, he will then, it appears, "feel warranted, to turn a portion of his time and means, from the direct service of God and his fellow-men, in the indulgence of irrelevant, captious, and pernicious questions."—So much for his challenging me in Edinburgh.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY JOURNALS.

The Anti-Slavery Newspapers, published Weekly, in the United States, which will give correct Anti-Slavery information, are:—

THE LIBERATOR, by WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, *price 10s. per annum.*
HERALD OF FREEDOM, by NATHANIEL P. ROGERS, *price 8s. per annum.*
PENNSYLVANIA FREEMAN, by CHARLES C. BURLIGH, *price 8s. per annum.*
And the **NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD**, by LYDIA M. CHILD, *price 10s. per annum.*

These Journals may be regularly received, once-a-fortnight, from either of the following Agents in Great Britain:—

E. PEASE, *Darlington.*—**WILLIAM SMEAL**, *Glasgow.*—**R. D. WEBB**, *Dublin.*

TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

DEAR FRIENDS,—The cause of the oppressed Negro in the United States must be sustained. The Abolitionists are now passing through a fiery ordeal. The sacrifices which they have made, to sustain their Organizations, have been unequalled by any body of men, since the days of primitive Christianity. To raise money to support the American Anti-Slavery Society, some have sold their furniture, others have mortgaged their property, some have thrown in their jewels, others have dispensed with the most ordinary comforts of life, that the bondsman's cause might not be permitted to fail. Their language and their feelings are:—

"Down let the shrine of Moloch sink,

And leave no traces where it stood—

Nor longer let its idol drink

His daily cup of human blood."

The Committee need funds to maintain their official organ, the "*National Anti-Slavery Standard*," a large weekly periodical;—its Secretaries and Agents,—and to circulate information on the subject of Emancipation over the United States. Any amount forwarded to **THOMAS STURGE**, New Kent Road, London; **ELIZABETH PEASE**, *Darlington*; **JANE WIGHAM**, and **Mrs. H. GAIRDNER**, *Edinburgh*; **WILLIAM SMEAL**, *Glasgow*; or **R. D. WEBB**, *Dublin*, will be forwarded to the Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, by whom it will be duly acknowledged and faithfully appropriated.

Faithfully your Friend,

J. A. COLLINS,

Representative of the American Anti-Slavery Society.